

Transparent anisotropy for the relaxed micromorphic model: macroscopic consistency conditions and long wave length asymptotics

Gabriele Barbagallo,¹ Marco Valerio d'Agostino², Rafael Abreu³ Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba,⁴
Angela Madeo⁵ and Patrizio Neff⁶

January 19, 2016

“Pluralitas non est ponenda sine necessitate.” - “Plurality should not to be supposed without necessity.”

John Duns Scotus - “Ordinatio”

Abstract

For the recently introduced relaxed micromorphic model we suggest a simplified centro-symmetric anisotropic representation with respect to the elastic energy contribution as well as the micro-inertia density. Only classical elasticity-tensors with at most 21 independent components are studied together with rotational coupling tensors with at most 6 independent components. For this simplified formulation we show how relations between these tensors in the long wavelengths limit can be derived in order to facilitate their experimental determination. Moreover, our new formulas which we call “macroscopic consistency conditions” lend themselves to a natural consequence: the macroscopic response of the considered medium should always be weaker than the microscopic one, viz. smaller is stiffer. We also show that a similar conclusion is not possible with the standard Mindlin-Eringen-format of anisotropic micromorphic moduli. Our results generalize the formulas previously established for the isotropic case. In such simplified framework, the macroscopic stiffness tensor turns out to be half the harmonic mean of the microscopic stiffness and the elastic stiffness, thereby recovering the Reuss-bound. For the curvature expression our reduction implies the possibility to work with second order tensors even for higher order terms.

Keywords: relaxed micromorphic model, anisotropy, arithmetic mean, geometric mean, harmonic mean, Reuss-bound, Voigt-bound, generalized continuum models, long wavelength limit, macroscopic consistency, Cauchy continuum, homogenization, multi-scale modeling, parameter identification, non-redundant model

AMS 2010 subject classification: 74A10 (stress), 74A30 (nonsimple materials), 74A35 (polar materials), 74A60 (micromechanical theories), 74B05 (classical linear elasticity), 74E10 (anisotropy), 74E15 (crystalline structure), 74M25 (micromechanics), 74Q15 (effective constitutive equations)

¹Gabriele Barbagallo, gabriele.barbagallo@insa-lyon.fr, LaMCoS-CNRS & LGCIE, INSA-Lyon, Université de Lyon, 20 avenue Albert Einstein, 69621, Villeurbanne cedex, France

²Marco Valerio d'Agostino, marco-valerio.dagostino@insa-lyon.fr, LGCIE, INSA-Lyon, Université de Lyon, 20 avenue Albert Einstein, 69621, Villeurbanne cedex, France

³Rafael Abreu, abreu@uni-muenster.de, Institut für Geophysik, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Corrensstraße 24, 48149, Münster, Germany

⁴Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba, dumitrel.ghiba@uni-due.de, dumitrel.ghiba@uaic.ro, Lehrstuhl für Nichtlineare Analysis und Modellierung, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Thea-Leymann Str. 9, 45127 Essen, Germany; Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Department of Mathematics, Blvd. Carol I, no. 11, 700506 Iași, Romania; and Octav Mayer Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, Iași Branch, 700505 Iași.

⁵Angela Madeo, angela.madeo@insa-lyon.fr, LGCIE, INSA-Lyon, Université de Lyon, 20 avenue Albert Einstein, 69621, Villeurbanne cedex, France

⁶Patrizio Neff, corresponding author, patrizio.neff@uni-due.de, Head of Chair for Nonlinear Analysis and Modelling, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Mathematik-Carrée, Thea-Leymann-Straße 9, 45127 Essen

Contents

1	Prelude	3
2	Introduction	3
3	Notational agreement	6
4	A review on the micromorphic approach	7
4.1	The standard Mindlin-Eringen model	7
4.2	The relaxed micromorphic model	8
4.2.1	Micro-macro coupling - respecting orthogonality	9
4.2.2	Microscopic curvature	10
4.2.3	Micro-inertia density	12
4.2.4	Energy formulations and equilibrium equations for various symmetries	12
4.2.5	Linear elasticity as upper energetic limit for the relaxed micromorphic model - statics	13
4.3	Certain limiting cases of the relaxed micromorphic continuum	14
4.4	Macroscopic consistency condition	14
5	Mandel-Voigt vector notation	15
5.1	Symmetric terms	16
5.2	Skew-symmetric terms - rotational coupling	18
6	The macroscopic limit of the relaxed model ($L_c \rightarrow 0$) - macroscopic consistency conditions	20
6.1	Equilibrium equations	20
6.2	The general relaxed anisotropic case in the limit $L_c \rightarrow 0$	21
6.3	Particularization for specific symmetries	23
6.3.1	The isotropic case	23
6.3.2	The cubic symmetry case	24
6.3.3	The orthotropic case	26
6.4	The long wavelength limit - dynamic considerations	27
6.5	Properties of the resulting constitutive tensors	28
6.5.1	Symmetry	28
6.5.2	Positive definiteness	28
7	Non reduction for the standard Mindlin-Eringen model	29
8	The microscopic limit - static considerations	31
8.1	The standard Mindlin-Eringen model	31
8.2	The relaxed micromorphic model but with $\ \nabla P\ ^2$	32
8.3	The relaxed micromorphic model with $\ \text{Curl } P\ ^2$	33
9	Conclusion	33
10	References	34
11	Appendix - One-dimensional standard Mindlin-Eringen model versus new relaxed micromorphic model	37
12	Appendix - Demonstration of equation (66)	38

1 Prelude

Modeling in continuum mechanics is an art encompassing mathematics, mechanics, physics and experiments. Many researchers have been attracted to the field of generalized continuum mechanics, following the works of the masters Mindlin and Eringen and have dwelt on the description of this or that aspect of generalized continuum theories, coupled with whatever additional effect. That has been done, while fundamental questions concerning the range of applicability or the descriptive power of generalized continuum mechanics had not been settled leading to an understandable disdain of the majority of researchers in continuum mechanics for these models. We, on the contrary, believe in the usefulness of generalized continuum mechanical models but at the same time we see their current shortcomings.

Progress in science, we think, does not consist in producing a zoo of possibilities and to combine more effects (which are themselves not yet properly understood), but in **reducing complexity** and in explaining in simpler terms previously non-connected ideas without losing the accuracy in the mathematical description of the physical problem.

A major guidance for enlightened modeling certainly comes from the experimental side. Basing ourselves on the phenomena we want to describe, we should not use superfluous information (superfluous because in practice, it cannot be determined) and, among valid competing hypotheses, the one with the **simplest** assumptions should be selected: simpler theories are preferable to more complex ones because these latter are more easily falsifiable.

In this work we deal with the anisotropic relaxed micromorphic model in this spirit directed towards simplification. Whether we have achieved a step into this direction must be judged by our readers.

2 Introduction

Recent years have seen a colossal increase of interest in so called generalized continuum models. This is due to the need felt to incorporate, viewed from the phenomenological level, additional features like the discreteness of micro-structural matter, characteristic length scales, dispersion of waves, among others. All such features are not captured by standard elasticity approaches. For example, metamaterials obtained by suitably assembling multiple individual elements at the microscopic scale show very peculiar macroscopic mechanical properties. Indeed, the particular shape, geometry, size, orientation and arrangement of their constituting elements can affect, e.g., the propagation of waves in a not-already-observed manner, creating unorthodox material properties which cannot be found in conventional materials. Particularly promising in the design of metamaterials are those micro-structures which present high contrast in microscopic properties: these micro-structures, once homogenized, may produce geometrically nonlinear generalized continuum models (see, e.g., [21–25]). One of the most known generalized continuum model is the micromorphic continuum introduced by Mindlin and Eringen [11, 16–19, 49] in the early sixties of the last century. It includes many special cases among which the much older Cosserat-type models [5, 12, 20, 34, 35, 40, 58, 65, 66].

In this paper we do not recount the historic development, referring the reader to [64] for this purpose. Furthermore, we restrict attention to the linearized framework noting that the first encompassing existence result for the geometrically nonlinear static case has been obtained in [34] including a previous result for the nonlinear Cosserat model in [57]. In order to find more about existence results for micromorphic models at finite deformations we refer the reader to [59–61]. Further existence results are supplied by [14, 15, 46, 47]. There are many applications treated within the nonlinear micromorphic framework among which we limit ourselves to mention [29–33, 36, 41, 48, 72–74, 80, 81].

In the micromorphic model, it is the kinematics which is enriched by introducing an additional field of **non-symmetric micro-distortions** $P : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, beyond the classical macroscopic displacement $u : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$. Then, a **non-symmetric elastic (relative) distortion** $e = \nabla u - P$ can be defined and the modeling proceeds by obtaining the constitutive relations linking elastic-distortions to stresses and by postulating a balance equation for the micro-distortion field P . All such steps might be preferably done in a variational framework, involving the third order curvature tensor (the micro-distortion gradient) ∇P , such that only energy contributions need to be defined a priori. For the dynamic case, one adds in the Hamiltonian so-called micro-inertia density contributions, acting on the time derivatives of micro-distortion terms P_t .

In principle, the modeling framework for the micromorphic approach had been completed by Eringen, Mindlin, in the references already cited, and Germain [26]. Notably, extensions to anisotropy have been




Figure 1: Enriched kinematics for a micromorphic continuum. The macroscopic deformation of the body $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is described by $\varphi : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$. In each macroscopic material point $x \in \Omega$ there is a substructure attached. This substructure has the possibility to shear, stretch and shrink described by an affine mapping $\mathbb{1} + P$. Decisive is how the fields of macroscopic displacement u and micro-distortions P get coupled. Our new relaxed micromorphic model introduces the weakest possible coupling still giving a well-posed model.

readily obtained.

The existence and uniqueness questions for the linear micromorphic model have been completely settled both for the static and dynamic case, based on the assumption of **uniform positive definiteness** of the appearing constitutive elasticity tensors. However, the over-reliance on uniform positive definiteness, we believe, has blinded the eye for the real possibilities inherent in the micromorphic model. These possibilities have been consistently overlooked until very recently.

This paper is, therefore, meant as a further eye-opener beyond the series of articles [28, 43, 44, 63, 64] in which we have introduced the novel concept of the **relaxed micromorphic continuum**. What, then, is the essence of the relaxed micromorphic approach?

First, regarding the elastic response, the relaxed model mainly works with **symmetric elastic (relative) strains** $\varepsilon_e := \text{sym}(\nabla u - P)$. Thereby, standard 4th order elasticity tensors can be used in order to define elastic stresses. Second, regarding the curvature, the relaxed model considers the **second order dislocation-density tensor** $\alpha = -\text{Curl } P$ instead of the third order curvature tensor ∇P with the effect (among others) that the description of anisotropy of curvature would only need 4th order tensors, instead of 6th order ones.

Moreover, the fact of using the dislocation density tensor $\text{Curl } P$ also settles the disputed question of possible boundary conditions for the micro-distortion field P : only tangential boundary conditions can be prescribed, e.g. $P \cdot \tau|_{\partial\Omega}$ or $(\nabla u - P) \cdot \tau|_{\partial\Omega}$ can be given.

It has to be noted that our new approach is only formally included in the standard Mindlin-Eringen micromorphic model since we consistently give up uniform positive-definiteness in the elastic distortion e and the curvature tensor ∇P which are instead strictly requested in the standard model in order to have well-posedness. For example, controlling only the elastic strain $\varepsilon_e = \text{sym}(\nabla u - P)$ in the energy does not locally control the elastic distortion $e = \nabla u - P$ and working with $\text{Curl } P$ does not control the curvature ∇P .

A fundamental contribution of the relaxed micromorphic model is given by the fact that well-posedness results have been proven [64] also if the strain energy density violates strict positive-definiteness. In other words, even if the relaxed micromorphic model can be apparently seen as a particular case of the Mindlin-Eringen model by suitably setting to zero some constitutive parameters of their model (see [44, p. 555]), such choice is not acceptable in the Mindlin-Eringen setting due to the loss of positive-definiteness of the energy. Nevertheless, it is exactly this feature which makes the relaxed micromorphic model unique for the description of a wealth of unorthodox material behaviors. The existence results proposed in [64] comfort us concerning the opportunity of using the relaxed micromorphic model for describing the phenomena we are interested in.

The main exotic behavior which we proved can be described by the relaxed micromorphic model is the onset of complete frequency band-gaps in metamaterials [44]. It is indeed proven that the fact of accounting for curvature energies depending on $\|\text{Curl } P\|^2$ instead of $\|\nabla P\|^2$ (as done by Mindlin and Eringen) is a **necessary** feature to describe band-gap behaviors. If the whole gradient of P is present in the strain energy density band-gaps are strictly forbidden.

The second feature which we proved in [44] to be necessary for the onset of band-gaps is the fact of considering a term of the type $\mu_c \|\text{skew}(\nabla u - P)\|^2$ in the strain energy density. The Cosserat couple modulus μ_c must be non-vanishing in order to let band-gap phenomena appear.

The clear treatment concerning the mechanisms of band-gap onset in relaxed micromorphic media has already been of inspiration for researchers working on granular materials [50].⁷

We finally explicitly remark that the relaxed micromorphic model has a characteristic length and shows size-effects. However, its characteristic length is **not simply related** to the characteristic length in a second gradient model which can be obtained as singular limit of the standard Mindlin-Eringen format. Unfortunately, many researchers view the micromorphic model only as a way to “cheaply” implement a second gradient model by penalization. The relaxed micromorphic continuum is just doing the opposite, since compatible (gradient) contributions in the micro-distortions P are discarded! All this has been explained in [64].

Our new relaxed micromorphic model can also be viewed from a different angle: we may envisage that P represents the fluctuation over a unit cell while u describes the average displacement of the cell. Then our model assumes that the essential micro-structural fluctuations are incompatible, while all compatible (gradient) parts are subsumed into the macroscopic quantities. Using $\text{Curl } P$ as curvature measure is then consequential: it filters out the compatible part from the curvature.

In this paper, we want to present an approach to anisotropy for the relaxed micromorphic model. Our modeling perspective is to simplify as much as possible and indeed to reduce to an essential minimum the bewildering possibilities of the standard micromorphic model. Indeed, there is no point in exclaiming happily that the standard micromorphic model has more than 1000 constitutive coefficients which need to be determined. The true aim of modeling should consist of the opposite: to discard all unclear complications without compromising the essence of the model. We believe that the relaxed micromorphic model is just going in this direction, thereby opening the way for clear-cut experimental campaigns to determine the remaining fewer extra parameters.

The plan of the paper is as follows.

- We first recall the standard micromorphic model and contrast it with our new relaxed model. We also show that our relaxed micromorphic model supports a clear group-invariant framework, opening the way to speak about anisotropy classes. This hinges mainly on transformation properties of the dislocation density tensor $\alpha = -\text{Curl } P$, which will be discussed.
- We also present our favored description of anisotropy regarding the higher order contribution in $\text{Curl } P$. Thereby we split $\text{Curl } P = \text{sym } \text{Curl } P + \text{skew } \text{Curl } P$ and let a classical fourth order tensor act only on $\text{sym } \text{Curl } P \in \text{Sym}(3)$ together with another tensor with only 6 parameters acting on $\text{skew } \text{Curl } P \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$.

⁷ Although delighted by the fact of understanding that the relaxed micromorphic model might be of use for granular mechanics, we believe that some complements of information must be given in order to interpret the results of [50] in the clearest possible way. In [50] the authors use micro-macro upscaling techniques for granular assemblies thus arriving at a standard Mindlin-Eringen type model at the homogenized scale (see [50, p.224, eq. (43)]). The authors observe that: “*remarkably, the nonzero components in Mindlin’s stiffness tensors are the same as the non-zero components derived from the present model*”. Then, the authors present in equation (66) a constitutive choice of the microscopic parameters which goes in the sense of setting to zero the parameters of Mindlin’s model in order to get close to the relaxed micromorphic model. Such constitutive choice is not justified neither by telling that the scope is to recover the relaxed micromorphic model nor on clear microscopic-based arguments that would shed additional light on the understanding of microstructure-related effects.

Afterwards, the authors present [50, p.231, Fig. 5] two parametric studies on the parameters β_{mM} and β_{sM} . The parameter β_{mM} is an analogous of the Cosserat couple modulus μ_c and is once again seen to be determinant for the onset of band gaps. On the other hand, the parameter β_{sM} is the one that, being non vanishing, still makes a difference between Mindlin-Eringen’s and our relaxed model. The authors then present a parametric study letting β_{sM} to zero, which indeed means that they are recovering the relaxed micromorphic model as a limit case. Nevertheless, except some mostly confusing sentences referring to our paper [44], such fundamental observation are not made at any point of the paper [50].

It should be clearly stated that, by means of the proposed parametric study, they are trying to approach the relaxed micromorphic model and that, although the corresponding choice of the parameters is not allowed in Mindlin-Eringen theory, the well-posedness is still guaranteed. Moreover, it should have been clearly stated that the **relaxed micromorphic model** is the **only generalized continuum model**, among those currently used, which is able to predict **complete frequency band-gaps** [28, 43, 44, 63].

Finally, and this would be for us the main advancement related to the paper [50], a clear microscopic-based interpretation of the fact of setting to zero the opportune parameters in Mindlin’s theory would be necessary in further works since it is not currently done in [50]. Of course, the fact of setting to zero some macroscopic parameters leads to some conditions on some microscopic parameters, but which is the physical interpretation of such conditions on micro-parameters?

In summary, the same goal of clarity that we try to pursue in this paper should be, from our point of view, shared by the higher possible number of researchers in order to proceed in the direction of a global advancement of knowledge.

- Then, we consider the long-wavelength limit (characteristic length $L_c \rightarrow 0$) which must coincide with a linear elastic model that has lost any characteristic length (sometimes erroneously called internal variable model). From this hypothesis, we are able to relate coefficients of the micromorphic scale to the macroscopic ones. The result is a convincing homogenization formula for all considered anisotropy classes. This is also done using classical Voigt-notation in order to facilitate future applications.
- We study the format of a possible anisotropic local rotational coupling term acting on $\text{skew}(\nabla u - P)$. In this respect we also investigate some possibilities of approximating an anisotropic coupling by an isotropic one.
- We consider the formal limit $L_c \rightarrow \infty$ and show that it corresponds to a “zoom” into the micro-structure. Our relaxed model supports as well a clear interpretation for that regime.
- We end our paper by showing that the standard Mindlin-Eringen micromorphic model does not, in general, support the clear relation between macroscopic and microscopic elasticity moduli which is instead provided by our simplified anisotropic relaxed model.

3 Notational agreement

Throughout this paper Latin subscripts take the values 1, 2, 3 while Greek subscripts take the values 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and we adopt the Einstein convention of sum over repeated indexes if not differently specified.

We denote by $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ the set of real 3×3 second order tensors and by $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3}$ the set of real $3 \times 3 \times 3$ third order tensors. The standard Euclidean scalar product on $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is given by $\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} = \text{tr}(X \cdot Y^T)$ and, thus, the Frobenius tensor norm is $\|X\|^2 = \langle X, X \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}$. Moreover, the identity tensor on $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{1}$, so that $\text{tr}(X) = \langle X, \mathbb{1} \rangle$. We adopt the usual abbreviations of Lie-algebra theory, i.e.:

- $\text{Sym}(3) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \mid X^T = X\}$ denotes the vector-space of all symmetric 3×3 matrices
- $\mathfrak{so}(3) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \mid X^T = -X\}$ is the Lie-algebra of skew symmetric tensors
- $\mathfrak{sl}(3) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \mid \text{tr}(X) = 0\}$ is the Lie-algebra of traceless tensors
- $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \simeq \mathfrak{gl}(3) = \{\mathfrak{sl}(3) \cap \text{Sym}(3)\} \oplus \mathfrak{so}(3) \oplus \mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbb{1}$ is the *orthogonal Cartan-decomposition of the Lie-algebra*

For all $X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, we consider the decomposition

$$X = \text{dev sym} X + \text{skew} X + \frac{1}{3} \text{tr}(X) \mathbb{1} \quad (1)$$

where:

- $\text{sym} X = \frac{1}{2}(X^T + X) \in \text{Sym}(3)$ is the symmetric part,
- $\text{skew} X = \frac{1}{2}(X - X^T) \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ is the skew-symmetric part,
- $\text{dev} X = X - \frac{1}{3} \text{tr}(X) \mathbb{1} \in \mathfrak{sl}(3)$ is the deviatoric part .

Throughout all the paper we indicate:

- with hat, i.e. $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}$, the sixth order tensors $\widehat{\mathbb{L}} : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3}$
- with overline, i.e. $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$, the fourth order tensors $\overline{\mathbb{C}} : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$
- without superscripts, i.e. $\mathbb{C}$, the classical fourth order tensors acting only on symmetric matrices $\mathbb{C} : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ or skew-symmetric ones $\mathbb{C}_c : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$
- with tilde, i.e. $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$, the second order tensors $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_c : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ appearing as elastic stiffness.

We indicate by $\overline{\mathbb{C}}X$ the linear application of a tensor of 4^{th} order to a tensor of 2^{nd} order and also for the linear application of a tensor $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}$ of 6^{th} order to a 3^{rd} order tensor. In formulas, we have:

$$(\overline{\mathbb{C}}X)_{ij} = \overline{\mathbb{C}}_{ijk}X_{hk}, \quad (\widehat{\mathbb{L}}A)_{ijh} = \widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{ijhpqr}A_{pqr}. \quad (2)$$

The operation of simple contraction between tensors of suitable order is denoted by a central dot as, for example:

$$(\widetilde{\mathbb{C}} \cdot v)_i = \widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_{ij}v_j, \quad (\widetilde{\mathbb{C}} \cdot X)_{ij} = \widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_{ih}X_{hj}. \quad (3)$$

Typical conventions for differential operations are implied such as a comma followed by a subscript to denote the partial derivative with respect to the corresponding Cartesian coordinate, in formulas $(\cdot)_{,j} = \frac{\partial(\cdot)}{\partial x_j}$.

Here, given a skew-symmetric matrix $\overline{A} \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ we consider:

$$\overline{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \overline{A}_{12} & \overline{A}_{13} \\ -\overline{A}_{12} & 0 & \overline{A}_{23} \\ -\overline{A}_{13} & -\overline{A}_{23} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{axl}(\overline{A}) = (-\overline{A}_{23}, \overline{A}_{13}, -\overline{A}_{12})^T. \quad (4)$$

ore equivalently in index notation:

$$[\text{axl}(\overline{A})]_k = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\overline{A}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{kij}\overline{A}_{ji}, \quad (5)$$

where ϵ is the Levi-Civita third order permutation tensor.

4 A review on the micromorphic approach

4.1 The standard Mindlin-Eringen model

The elastic energy of the general anisotropic centro-symmetric micromorphic model in the sense of Mindlin-Eringen (see [49] and [17, p. 270, eq. 7.1.4]) can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned} W = & \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - P), (\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{full anisotropic elastic - energy}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P, \text{sym} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{micro - self - energy}} \\ & + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \overline{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{cross}} (\nabla u - P), \text{sym} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{anisotropic cross - coupling}} + \underbrace{\frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \langle \widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\text{aniso}} \nabla P, \nabla P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3}}}_{\text{full anisotropic curvature}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is a 4^{th} order micromorphic elasticity tensor which has at most 45 independent coefficients and which acts on the **non-symmetric elastic distortion** $e = \nabla u - P$ and $\overline{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{cross}} : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ is a 4^{th} order cross-coupling tensor with the symmetry $(\overline{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{cross}})_{ijkl} = (\overline{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{cross}})_{jikl}$ having at most 54 independent coefficients. The fourth order tensor $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ has the classical 21 independent coefficients of classical elasticity, while $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\text{aniso}} : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3}$ is a 6^{th} order tensor that shows an astonishing 378 parameters. The parameter $\mu > 0$ is a typical shear modulus and $L_c > 0$ is one characteristic length, while $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\text{aniso}}$ is, accordingly, dimensionless. Here, for simplicity, we have assumed just a decoupled format of the energy: mixed terms of strain and curvature have been discarded by assuming **centro-symmetry**. Counting the number of coefficients we have $45 + 21 + 54 + 378 = 498$ independent coefficients.

If we assume an isotropic behavior of the curvature we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} W = & \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - P), (\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{full anisotropic elastic - energy}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P, \text{sym} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{micro - self - energy}} \\ & + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \overline{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{cross}} (\nabla u - P), \text{sym} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{anisotropic cross - coupling}} + \underbrace{\frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \langle \widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\text{iso}} \nabla P, \nabla P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3 \times 3}}}_{\text{isotropic curvature}}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the 6th order tensor $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{\text{iso}}$ has still 11 independent non-dimensional constants [17]. This can be explained considering that the general isotropic 6th order tensor has 15 coefficients which, considering that in a quadratic form representation we can assume a mayor symmetry of the type $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{ijklmn} = \widehat{\mathbb{L}}_{lmnij k}$, reduce to 11 (see [52, 77]).⁸ On the other hand, the local energy has 7 independent coefficients in the isotropic case: $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e$ has 3, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \sim 2$, $\overline{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{cross}} \sim 2$ adding up to the usual 18 constitutive coefficients to be determined in the isotropic case.

One of the major obstacles in using the micromorphic approach for specific materials is the impossibility to determine such multitude of new material coefficients. Not only is the huge number a technical problem, but also the interpretation of coefficients is problematic [8–10]. Some of these coefficients are size-dependent while others are not. A purely formal approach, as it is often done, cannot be the final answer.

4.2 The relaxed micromorphic model

Our novel relaxed micromorphic model endows Mindlin-Eringen’s representation with more geometric structure. Since $\overline{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{cross}}$ is difficult to interpret it is discarded right-away. Nevertheless, the structure of the model continues to be very rich. We write:

$$W = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P), \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{anisotropic elastic - energy}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P, \text{sym} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{micro - self - energy}} \quad (8)$$

$$+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P), \text{skew}(\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{invariant local anisotropic rotational elastic coupling}} + \underbrace{\frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \langle \overline{\mathbb{L}}_{\text{aniso}} \text{Curl} P, \text{Curl} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{curvature}}.$$

The second order tensor $\alpha = -\text{Curl} P$ is called the **dislocation density tensor**.⁹ Here $\mathbb{C}_e, \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ are both classical 4th order elasticity tensors **acting on symmetric second order tensors** only: $\mathbb{C}_e$ acts on the **symmetric elastic strain** $\varepsilon_e := \text{sym}(\nabla u - P)$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ acts on the **symmetric micro-strain** $\text{sym} P$ and both map to symmetric tensors. The tensor $\mathbb{C}_c : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$ is a 4th order tensor that acts only on skew-symmetric matrices and yields only skew-symmetric tensors and $\overline{\mathbb{L}}_{\text{aniso}} : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is a dimensionless 4th order tensor with at most 45 constants. Counting coefficients we have now 21+21+6+45=93 instead of Mindlin-Eringen’s 498 coefficients. The main advantage at this stage is that our $\mathbb{C}_e$, unlike $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e$, possesses all the symmetries that are peculiar of the classical elasticity tensors acting on $\text{sym} \nabla u$.

The large number of isotropic constants in the standard Mindlin-Eringen model has always been of concern. Previous attempts to endow the Mindlin-Eringen model with more structure include Koh’s [37, 71] so-called micro-isotropy postulate which requires, among others, that $\text{sym} \sigma$ is an isotropic function of $\text{sym} \nabla u$ only. As far as the local terms, this reduces the number of isotropic coefficient also to 5 (similarly to our relaxed model) but connecting $\text{sym} \sigma$ to $\text{sym} \nabla u$ only does not make much sense.

Considering the energy in equation (8), the resulting elastic (relative) stress is:

$$\sigma(\nabla u, P) = \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P), \quad (9)$$

which is solely related to elastic distortions $e = \nabla u - P$. We envisage that the coefficients in $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ are in principle more or less well known as moduli of the smallest representative cell for the micro-structure. Not known is the tensor $\mathbb{C}_e$ as well as the rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ for the skew-symmetric part.

Our **macroscopic consistency condition**, to be introduced below, allows to establish an **a priori relation** between $\mathbb{C}_e, \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ on the one hand and some experimentally measurable macroscopic elasticity tensor $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$. In fact, linking $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ we are able to determine a unique tensor $\mathbb{C}_e$! This unique feature of our relaxed model gives again more credibility to the relaxed approach. It also opens a way for clear experimental campaigns to determine some of the new micromorphic elastic constants.

⁸which reduces further the number to 5 by using that the curvature expression in strain gradient elasticity, which replaces ∇P , is $\nabla \varepsilon$ or $\nabla \nabla u = \nabla^2 u$, having both additional symmetries, see [13].

⁹The dislocation tensor is defined as $\alpha_{ij} = -(\text{Curl} P)_{ij} = -P_{ih,k} \epsilon_{j h k}$, where ϵ is the Levi-Civita tensor.

In the general anisotropic micromorphic model initially proposed by Mindlin-Eringen [19] the question of parameters identification has already been treated. However, the resulting interpretation of the material constants, as well as their connection to the classical anisotropy formulation of linear elasticity, is still not settled satisfactorily.

As already seen, in our relaxed model the complexity of the general micromorphic model has been decisively reduced featuring basically only symmetric strain-like variables and the Curl of the micro-distortion P . However, the relaxed model is still general enough to include the full micro-stretch as well as the full Cosserat micro-polar model, see [64]. Furthermore, well-posedness results for the static and dynamic cases have been provided in [64] making decisive use of recently established new coercive inequalities, generalizing Korn's inequality to incompatible tensor fields [3, 56, 68–70].

4.2.1 Micro-macro coupling - respecting orthogonality

In this subsection we analyze the coupling between the displacement u and the micro-distortion P . Considering the scalar product $\langle X, Y \rangle = \text{tr}(X \cdot Y^T)$, we start by noticing that $\mathbb{C}_e$ and $\mathbb{C}_c$ respect the **orthogonal decomposition**

$$X = \text{sym}X \oplus \text{skew}X, \quad (10)$$

in the sense that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}X + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}X] &= \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}X, \\ \text{skew} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}X + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}X] &= \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}X. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Now, we recall that the elastic (relative) stress is:

$$\sigma(\nabla u, P) = \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P). \quad (12)$$

Therefore, in our relaxed anisotropic model the skew-symmetry of the elastic (relative) Cauchy stress σ is entirely controlled by the rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ since we have

$$\text{skew} \sigma = \text{skew} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P)] = \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P). \quad (13)$$

For a positive definite coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ we note that skew-symmetric Cauchy stresses $\text{skew} \sigma \neq 0$ occur if and only if $\text{skew}(\nabla u - P) \neq 0$.

If $\mathbb{C}_c \equiv 0$, the elastic Cauchy stress σ satisfies **Boltzmann's axiom of symmetry of force stresses**. In addition, for $\mathbb{C}_c \equiv 0$, the **elastic distortion** $e = \nabla u - P$ can be non-symmetric, while the elastic stresses σ remain symmetric.¹⁰

In [72] the authors have introduced the original and important notion of **non-redundant strain measures** in the micromorphic continuum. As it turns out, the relaxed micromorphic model with zero rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c = 0$ is a *non-redundant micromorphic formulation*, as the authors show. In contrast, the standard Mindlin-Eringen model remains **redundant**¹¹, as does the linear Cosserat model.

¹⁰Therefore, using $\mathbb{C}_c = 0$ is similar to the Reuss-bound approach in homogenization theory in which the guiding assumption is that the stress fields are taken constant but fluctuations in strain are allowed. Here, analogously, we would assume symmetric stresses σ but non-symmetric distortion-fluctuations in $e = \nabla u - P$. Already Voigt (see [83, p.596]) discussed non-symmetric states of distortion. However, we can supply some further support for using $\mathbb{C}_c \equiv 0$. Indeed as Kröner notes [38], “*asymmetric stress tensors only come under consideration when a distribution of rotational moments acts upon the body externally, which is excluded here. The question of whether the (...) rotations produces stresses can also be answered. We must first exclude asymmetric stress tensors, since they contradict the laws of equilibrium in the theory of elasticity*”. Furthermore, Kunin [39, p. 21] states the following theorem: *in the nonlocal theory of a linear elastic medium of simple structure with finite action-at-a-distance, it is always possible to introduce a symmetric stress tensor and an energy density, which can be expressed in terms of stress and strain in the usual way.*

¹¹The standard Mindlin-Eringen model with full curvature is already non-redundant provided there is no rotational coupling present. In this case it loses positive-definiteness but well-posedness is assured along the lines of [69].

With the Boltzmann's hypothesis, that is in sharp contrast to standard micromorphic models, the model would feature symmetric force-stress tensors. Such an assumption has been made, for example, by Teisseyre [78, 79] in his model for the description of seismic wave propagation phenomena (for the use of micromorphic models for earthquake modeling see also the discussion in [55]).

It must also be observed that the relaxed micromorphic model can be used with $\mathbb{C}_c$ positive semi-definite or indeed zero (in the isotropic case $\mu_c = 0$), while we assume throughout that $\mathbb{C}_e$, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ (and later $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$) are strictly positive definite tensors.

Due to their intrinsic definition, the format of $\mathbb{C}_e$, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ is therefore defined a priori to be the classical anisotropy format with 21 independent components. What remains to be determined are the numerical values of the coefficients in $\mathbb{C}_e$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ on the one side and of $\mathbb{C}_c$ on the other side. Assuming the $\mathbb{C}_e$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ are positive definite tensor means that:

$$\exists c_e^+ > 0 : \forall S \in \text{Sym}(3) : \langle \mathbb{C}_e S, S \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \geq c_e^+ \|S\|_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}^2. \quad (14)$$

In sharp contrast to the standard Mindlin-Eringen format, we assume for the rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ only positive semi-definiteness, i.e:

$$\forall \bar{A} \in \mathfrak{so}(3) : \langle \mathbb{C}_c \bar{A}, \bar{A} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

As already noticed, this allows the rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ to vanish, in which case the relaxed micromorphic model is **non-redundant** [72].¹²

The reader might ask himself: how is it possible that the rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ can be absent but the resulting model is still well-posed? This is possible because in that case, the skew-symmetric part of P is controlled not locally but as a result of the boundary value problem and boundary conditions. In this sense, allowing for $\mathbb{C}_c \equiv 0$ is one of the decisive new possibilities offered by the relaxed micromorphic model.

However, in [44] it has been shown that in the isotropic case ($\mathbb{C}_c = \mu_c \mathbb{1}$) the presence of $\mathbb{C}_c$ allows to control the onset of band-gaps. In section 5 we discuss the possible forms that $\mathbb{C}_c$ has for certain given anisotropy classes.

4.2.2 Microscopic curvature

In our relaxed framework, we have introduced the reduction of the curvature energy term in the general micromorphic model:

$$W_{\text{curv}} = W_{\text{curv}}(\nabla P), \quad (16)$$

to depend only on the second order dislocation density tensor through:

$$W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}} = W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(\text{Curl } P). \quad (17)$$

First, we remark here that in the relaxed micromorphic curvature expression we may also write:

$$\text{Curl } P = -\text{Curl}(\nabla u - P), \quad (18)$$

because $\text{Curl } P$ is invariant under $P \rightarrow P + \nabla \vartheta$, see [63].

Now, we need to shortly discuss that such a reduced formulation is fully able to be treated in an invariant setting. To this end, we let $P : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ be the micro-distortion field and we subject it to the following coordinate transformation (generating the so-called Rayleigh-action on it [1]):

$$P^\#(\xi) := Q \cdot [P(Q^T \cdot \xi)] \cdot Q^T, \quad x = Q^T \cdot \xi, \quad (19)$$

for given $Q \in \text{SO}(3)$. Note that transforming the displacement to a rotated reference and spatial configuration we have:

$$u^\#(\xi) := Q \cdot u(Q^T \cdot \xi), \quad \nabla_\xi u^\#(\xi) = Q \cdot \nabla_x u(Q^T \cdot \xi) \cdot Q^T, \quad (20)$$

¹²In Misra et al. [50] the rotational coupling $\mathbb{C}_c$ is related to the tangential stiffness between grains. This is consistent with Shimbo's law [75] relating the rotational stiffness to the internal friction. We need to remark that friction is, strictly speaking, a dissipative effect outside purely elastic response.

and thus we require, in fact, that P transforms as ∇u under simultaneous rotations of the reference and spatial configuration. Then it can be shown [53] that:

$$\text{Curl}_\xi P^\#(\xi) = Q \cdot [\text{Curl}_x P(Q^T \cdot \xi)] \cdot Q^T. \quad (21)$$

For the description of anisotropy in the curvature energy we require **form-invariance** of expression (17) for the transformation (19) with respect to all rotations $Q \in \mathcal{G}$ -material symmetry group. Taking into account (21) this means

$$\forall Q \in \mathcal{G} - \text{material symmetry group} : \quad W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(Q^T \cdot \text{Curl } P \cdot Q) = W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(\text{Curl } P). \quad (22)$$

Therefore, a first simplification of the curvature expression in the same spirit as done with the local energy terms is given by:

$$W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(\text{Curl } P) = \frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \left[\langle \mathbb{L}_e \text{sym Curl } P, \text{sym Curl } P \rangle + \langle \mathbb{L}_c \text{skew Curl } P, \text{skew Curl } P \rangle \right]. \quad (23)$$

Here, $\mathbb{L}_e : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ is a classical, positive definite elasticity tensor with at most 21 independent (non-dimensional) coefficients and $\mathbb{L}_c : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$ is a positive definite tensor with at most 6 independent (non-dimensional) coefficients. Considering isotropy of the formulation the total number of coefficients reduces altogether to 3, while in the cubic case we have 4 coefficients.

There is another reduction of the curvature expression thinkable which is fully consistent with group-invariance requirements. We can let:

$$W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}} = \widehat{W}_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(\text{sym Curl } P). \quad (24)$$

Considering the same transformation law (19) as before, the complete representation of the anisotropy in terms of the representation (24) is easy. We may, indeed, employ the classical format of the 4th order elasticity tensors to write:

$$\widehat{W}_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(\text{sym Curl } P) = \frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \langle \mathbb{L}_e \text{sym Curl } P, \text{sym Curl } P \rangle. \quad (25)$$

Here $\mathbb{L}_e : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ is a classical, positive definite elasticity tensor with at most 21 independent (non-dimensional) coefficients. The representation in (25) is certainly preferable for its simplicity in terms of the treatment of curvature-anisotropy. However, as of now, it is not clear whether a formulation with (25) can lead to a mathematical well-posedness result because of the current lack of a suitable coercive inequality for that case [2, 3]. Our guess at this moment is that it should work for the micro-incompressible case, in which the constraint $\text{tr } P = 0$ is appended. This case is reminiscent of gradient plasticity with plastic spin [14, 15, 68] in which the micro-distortion P is identified with the plastic distortion.

As explained in detail in [53], isotropy of the formulation regarding the curvature energy is tantamount to requiring **form-invariance** of expression (17) for the transformation (19), i.e.:

$$W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(\text{Curl}_\xi P^\#(\xi)) = W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(\text{Curl}_x P(x)). \quad (26)$$

Taking into account (21), isotropy of curvature is satisfied if and only if:

$$\forall Q \in \text{SO}(3) : \quad W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(Q \cdot (\text{Curl}_x P(x)) \cdot Q^T) = W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}(\text{Curl}_x P(x)). \quad (27)$$

i.e. $W_{\text{curv}}^{\text{relax}}$ must be an isotropic scalar function. We need to highlight the fact that $\text{Curl } P$ is not just an arbitrary combination of first derivatives of P (and as such included in the standard Mindlin-Eringen most general anisotropic micromorphic format) but that the formulation in $\text{Curl } P$ supports a completely invariant setting, as seen in [53], see [58]. Since $\text{Curl } P$ is a second order tensor, it allows us to dispose of 6th order curvature-stiffness tensors and to work instead with 4th order tensors whose anisotropy classification is much easier and well-known [7].

In general, if we consider an isotropic curvature term, we obtain the following representation:

$$\frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \langle \mathbb{L}_{\text{iso}} \text{Curl } P, \text{Curl } P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} = \frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \left(\alpha_1 \|\text{dev sym Curl } P\|^2 + \alpha_2 \|\text{skew Curl } P\|^2 + \alpha_3 [\text{tr}(\text{Curl } P)]^2 \right), \quad (28)$$

with scalar weighting parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \geq 0$. Since, in this paper, the curvature energy does not play a major role we will mostly use just $\|\text{Curl } P\|^2$, corresponding to $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 = 1$ and $\alpha_3 = \frac{1}{3}$.

4.2.3 Micro-inertia density

The dynamical formulation of the proposed relaxed micromorphic model is obtained in the following way. We define a joint Hamiltonian and obtain the equations from the postulate of stationary action. In order to generalize the kinetic energy density to the anisotropic micromorphic framework, we need to introduce a micro-inertia density contribution of the type:

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{J} P_{,t}, P_{,t} \rangle. \quad (29)$$

Here $\mathbb{J} : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is the 4th order micro-inertia density tensor with, in general, 45 independent coefficients. Eringen has added a conservation law for the micro-inertia density tensor $\mathbb{J}$, but in this work we assume a constant micro-inertia density tensor $\mathbb{J}$ as well as a constant mass density ρ . We assume throughout this paper that $\mathbb{J}$ is positive definite, i.e.:

$$\exists c^+ > 0 : \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} : \langle \mathbb{J} X, X \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \geq c^+ \|X\|_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}^2. \quad (30)$$

Considering dimensional consistency, we can always write the micro-inertia density tensor $\mathbb{J}$ as:

$$\mathbb{J} = \rho \hat{L}_c^2 \mathbb{J}_0, \quad (31)$$

where $\mathbb{J}_0 : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is dimensionless. Here, $\rho > 0$ is the mean mass density $[\rho] = kg/m^3$ and $\hat{L}_c \geq 0$ is another characteristic length $[\hat{L}_c] = m$. We also propose a split of this micro-inertia density, similar to the other terms like:

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{J} P_{,t}, P_{,t} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{J}_e \text{sym } P_{,t}, \text{sym } P_{,t} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{J}_c \text{skew } P_{,t}, \text{skew } P_{,t} \rangle. \quad (32)$$

Here, $\mathbb{J}_e : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ maps symmetric tensors into symmetric tensors while $\mathbb{J}_c : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$ maps skew-symmetric tensors to skew-symmetric tensors. We assume then that both $\mathbb{J}_e$ and $\mathbb{J}_c$ are positive definite.

In the isotropic case, the micro-inertia density tensor $\mathbb{J}_0$ can be represented by three dimensionless parameters $\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 > 0$ such that:

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{J} P_{,t}, P_{,t} \rangle = \frac{\rho \hat{L}_c^2}{2} \left(\eta_1 \|\text{dev sym } P_{,t}\|^2 + \eta_2 \|\text{skew } P_{,t}\|^2 + \eta_3 (\text{tr } (P_{,t}))^2 \right). \quad (33)$$

4.2.4 Energy formulations and equilibrium equations for various symmetries

Gathering our findings, we propose the following representation of the energy for the relaxed anisotropic centro-symmetric model which has maximally 21+21+6+21+6=75 independent coefficients:

$$\begin{aligned} W = & \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym } (\nabla u - P), \text{sym } (\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{anisotropic elastic - energy}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym } P, \text{sym } P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{micro - self - energy}} \\ & + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew } (\nabla u - P), \text{skew } (\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\text{invariant local anisotropic rotational elastic coupling}} \\ & + \underbrace{\frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} [\langle \mathbb{L}_e \text{sym Curl } P, \text{sym Curl } P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} + \langle \mathbb{L}_c \text{skew Curl } P, \text{skew Curl } P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}]}_{\text{curvature}}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In this formulation, the static and isotropic case requires to determine ($\mathbb{C}_e \sim 2$, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \sim 2$, $\mathbb{C}_c \sim 1$, $\mathbb{L}_e \sim 2$, $\mathbb{L}_c \sim 1$) altogether 8 constitutive coefficients of which the rotational coupling coefficient μ_c can be set to zero to enforce **symmetric** elastic stresses σ . As seen before, Eringen's formulation has 18 coefficients and Koh's [37] micro-isotropic model has still 10. Note that establishing positive-definiteness of the energy is now

an easy matter as compared to [76]: we only need to require positive definiteness of the occurring standard 4th order tensors $\mathbb{C}_e, \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}, \mathbb{C}_c, \mathbb{L}_e, \mathbb{L}_c$. Considering as the micro-inertia

$$\frac{\rho \hat{L}_c^2}{2} \langle \mathbb{J}_0 P_{,t}, P_{,t} \rangle, \quad (35)$$

the dynamical equilibrium equations for the anisotropic relaxed micromorphic model take the compact format:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho u_{,tt} &= \text{Div} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P)], \\ \rho \hat{L}_c^2 \mathbb{J}_0 P_{,tt} &= \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P) - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P \\ &\quad - \mu L_c^2 \text{Curl} (\mathbb{L}_e \text{sym} \text{Curl} P + \mathbb{L}_c \text{skew} \text{Curl} P). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

If we consider the isotropic case and the most simple curvature form, it is possible to reduce the relaxed representation to:

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \underbrace{\mu_e \|\text{sym} (\nabla u - P)\|^2 + \frac{\lambda_e}{2} \text{tr} (\text{sym} (\nabla u - P))^2}_{\text{isotropic elastic - energy}} + \underbrace{\mu_{\text{micro}} \|\text{sym} P\|^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\text{micro}}}{2} (\text{tr} (\text{sym} P))^2}_{\text{micro - self - energy}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\mu_c \|\text{skew} (\nabla u - P)\|^2}_{\text{invariant local isotropic rotational elastic coupling}} + \underbrace{\frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \|\text{Curl} P\|^2}_{\text{isotropic curvature}}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

and the isotropic format of the micro-inertia becomes:

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{J} P_{,t}, P_{,t} \rangle = \frac{\rho \hat{L}_c^2}{2} \left(\eta_1 \|\text{dev sym} P_{,t}\|^2 + \eta_2 \|\text{skew} P_{,t}\|^2 + \eta_3 (\text{tr} (P_{,t}))^2 \right). \quad (38)$$

The dynamical equilibrium equations for the isotropic relaxed micromorphic model take the form:

$$\rho u_{,tt} = \text{Div} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P)], \quad (39)$$

$$\eta_1 \rho \hat{L}_c^2 \text{dev sym} [P_{,tt}] = \text{dev sym} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P - \mu L_c^2 \text{Curl} \text{Curl} P],$$

$$\eta_2 \rho \hat{L}_c^2 \text{skew} [P_{,tt}] = \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P) - \mu L_c^2 \text{skew} \text{Curl} \text{Curl} P,$$

$$\eta_3 \rho \hat{L}_c^2 \text{tr} [P_{,tt}] = \text{tr} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P - \mu L_c^2 \text{Curl} \text{Curl} P].$$

4.2.5 Linear elasticity as upper energetic limit for the relaxed micromorphic model - statics

The relaxed micromorphic model at any characteristic length scale $L_c > 0$ admits linear elasticity as upper energetic limit. This can be seen considering that an admissible field for the micro-distortion P is always $P = \nabla u$ and a standard minimization argument shows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P), \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P, \text{sym} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P), \text{skew} (\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} + \frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \langle \mathbb{L}_{\text{aniso}} \text{Curl} P, \text{Curl} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \nabla u, \text{sym} \nabla u \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Thus we see that the relaxed model is always energetically **weaker** than a linear elastic comparison material with elastic stiffness $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ at any given stiffness $\mathbb{C}_e$. This, again, is a marked contrast to the standard Mindlin-Eringen format which will, in general, generate arbitrary stiffer response as simultaneously $L_c \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathbb{C}_e \rightarrow \infty$.

4.3 Certain limiting cases of the relaxed micromorphic continuum

Let us indicate certain limiting cases of the anisotropic relaxed micromorphic continuum. Since we assume $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}, \mathbb{C}_e$ to be positive definite and $\mathbb{C}_c$ positive semi-definite, there are three positive constants $c_{\text{dev}}^+, c_{\text{tr}}^+, c_c^+ > 0$ and $c_c^+ \geq 0$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P), \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} &\geq c_e^+ \|\text{sym}(\nabla u - P)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}^2, \\ \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P, \text{sym} P \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} &\geq c_{\text{dev}}^+ \|\text{dev sym} P\|_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}^2 + c_{\text{tr}}^+ (\text{tr}(P))^2, \\ \langle \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P), \text{skew}(\nabla u - P) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} &\geq c_c^+ \|\text{skew}(\nabla u - P)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Let us first consider:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathbb{C}_e > 0, \quad \mathbb{C}_c \geq 0, \quad P \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \quad (42)$$

by which we mean to assume that $c_{\text{dev}}^+, c_{\text{tr}}^+ \rightarrow \infty$. In this case, we obtain from bounded energy that formally $\|\text{sym} P\|^2 = 0$ and therefore that $P \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$. This resulting model is equivalent to the **Cosserat model or micropolar model**. The appearance of only $\text{Curl} P$ in the curvature is consistent with the classical Cosserat or micropolar model since for skew-symmetric $P(x) = A(x) \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ it holds that $\text{Curl} A$ is isomorphic to ∇A , see [67]. On the other hand, we may consider:

$$\text{dev sym } \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathbb{C}_e > 0, \quad \mathbb{C}_c \geq 0, \quad P \in \text{Sym}(3), \quad (43)$$

by which we mean to assume that $c_{\text{dev}}^+ \rightarrow \infty$ and $\text{skew} P = 0$. In this case, we obtain that $\|\text{dev sym} P\|^2 = 0$ and, therefore, we can derive that $P = \mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbb{1}$. This model is called **micro-dilation theory** (see [64]), again, the presence of $\text{Curl} P$ is fully consistent with the general micro-dilation theory. One more case is:

$$\text{tr } \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathbb{C}_e > 0, \quad \mathbb{C}_c \geq 0, \quad P \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \quad (44)$$

by which we mean to assume that $c_{\text{tr}}^+ \rightarrow \infty$ and, therefore, $\text{tr} P = 0$. In this case we obtain that $P \in \mathfrak{sl}(3)$. This model is the **micro-incompressible micromorphic model**. Analogously, we may consider:

$$\text{dev sym } \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathbb{C}_e > 0, \quad \mathbb{C}_c \geq 0, \quad P \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \quad (45)$$

by which we mean again to assume that $c_{\text{dev}}^+ \rightarrow \infty$. In this case we obtain only that $\|\text{dev sym} P\|^2 = 0$ and therefore that $P = \mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbb{1} + \mathfrak{so}(3)$. This set of models is called **micro-stretch theory** (see [64]).

Instead, if we just consider:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} > 0, \quad \mathbb{C}_e > 0, \quad \mathbb{C}_c \geq 0, \quad P \in \text{Sym}(3), \quad (46)$$

that means constraining P such that $\text{skew} P = 0$, then this resulting model is equivalent to Forest's **micro-strain model**, see [24]. Finally, if we consider:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} > 0, \quad \mathbb{C}_e \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathbb{C}_c = 0, \quad P \in \text{Sym}(3). \quad (47)$$

by which we mean to assume that $c_e^+ \rightarrow \infty$ and $\text{skew} P = 0$ obtaining that $\|\text{sym}(\nabla u - P)\|^2 = 0$. From these, it is possible to derive that $\text{sym } \nabla u = \text{sym} P = P$. With this last property, we obtain that the curvature term reduces to $\langle \bar{\mathbb{L}}_{\text{aniso}} \text{Curl sym } \nabla u, \text{Curl sym } \nabla u \rangle$. This resulting model is a variant of the indeterminate couple stress model, as treated in [27].

It is not possible to suitably restrict the parameters of the relaxed micromorphic model in order to obtain a **full higher gradient elasticity** model (e.g. see the Appendix), in sharp contrast to the standard Mindlin-Eringen model in which case $\mu_e \rightarrow \infty, \mu_c \rightarrow \infty$ implies $\nabla u = P$ and $\|\nabla P\|^2 \rightarrow \|\nabla \nabla u\|^2$.

4.4 Macroscopic consistency condition

In the following, we introduce a **macroscopic consistency condition** for our formulation: if the given material that is to be treated with a micromorphic model is available in very large sample sizes, then these samples may be used for classical mechanical testing by using the tools of classical linear elasticity. In

this way, we may determine a macroscopic elasticity tensor $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ which best fits the macroscopic behavior and we postulate the material to be able to be described by classical linear elasticity with energy:

$$W = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \text{sym} \nabla u, \text{sym} \nabla u \rangle \quad (48)$$

and the corresponding classical symmetric Cauchy stress:

$$\sigma(\text{sym} \nabla u) = \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \text{sym} \nabla u. \quad (49)$$

For very large sample sizes, however, a scaling argument shows easily that the **relative** characteristic length scale L_c of the micromorphic model must vanish. Therefore, we have a way of comparing the classical formulation (48) with (8) and to offer an **a priori relation** between $\mathbb{C}_e$, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ on the one side and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ on the other side.

In the isotropic case, this has been already done in [57,62] with the **isotropic macroscopic consistency conditions**:

$$(2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}}) = \frac{(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e)(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}})}{(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e) + (2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}})}, \quad (50)$$

$$\mu_{\text{macro}} = \frac{\mu_e \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}} = \mu_e (\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \mu_{\text{micro}}.$$

Or analogously:

$$(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e) = \frac{(2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}})(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}})}{(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}}) - (2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}})}, \quad (51)$$

$$\mu_e = \frac{\mu_{\text{macro}} \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_{\text{micro}} - \mu_{\text{macro}}} = \mu_{\text{macro}} (\mu_{\text{micro}} - \mu_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \mu_{\text{micro}}.$$

Note that these formulas determine μ_{macro} and κ_{macro} (the elastic bulk modulus $\kappa_{\text{macro}} = \frac{2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}}}{3}$) to be one half of the harmonic mean of μ_e , μ_{micro} , and κ_e , κ_{micro} respectively.

As a matter of fact, we have the **harmonic mean** $\mathcal{H}(\mu_e, \mu_{\text{micro}})$ defined for real numbers as:

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu_e, \mu_{\text{micro}}) = \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_e} + \frac{1}{\mu_{\text{micro}}} \right) \right]^{-1} = \frac{2\mu_e \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}}. \quad (52)$$

In the isotropic case, upon inspection of formula (51) we see that the “macroscopic” elastic response, embodied by μ_{macro} and λ_{macro} , cannot be equal or stiffer than the microscopic response, embodied by μ_{micro} and λ_{micro} . This is certainly physically sound and expresses in short that “**smaller is stiffer**”. Moreover, $\mu_{\text{micro}} = \mu_{\text{macro}}$ is tantamount to “micro=macro” and formally equivalent to $\mu_e \rightarrow \infty$.

5 Mandel-Voigt vector notation

We consider a general anisotropic expression for the relaxed micromorphic model (see equation (8)), given in index notation as:

$$\begin{aligned} W = & \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{ij} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{C}_c)_{ijkl} (\text{skew}(\nabla u - P))_{ij} (\text{skew}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} (\text{sym} P)_{ij} (\text{sym} P)_{kl} + \frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} (P_{ia,b} \epsilon_{jab}) (P_{ic,d} \epsilon_{jcd}), \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where ϵ is the Levi-Civita tensor. We note again that this is the most general format of the anisotropic relaxed micromorphic model. Here $\mathbb{C}_e$, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ have at most 21 independent constants, while $\mathbb{C}_c : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$ has at most 6 independent constants.

5.1 Symmetric terms

We now consider a linear mapping $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} : \text{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^6$ (as done in [45, 82, 83]) such that the independent components of $(\text{sym } \nabla u)_{ij}$ are isomorphically mapped in a corresponding vector ε_α such as:

$$\varepsilon_\alpha = \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{ij}. \quad (54)$$

And in the same fashion we have:

$$\beta_\alpha = \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} (\text{sym } P)_{ij}. \quad (55)$$

In the following Latin subscripts range in $\{1, 2, 3\}$ while Greek subscripts vary in $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$. Therefore, we have:

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} (\text{sym } P)_{11} \\ (\text{sym } P)_{22} \\ (\text{sym } P)_{33} \\ c (\text{sym } P)_{23} \\ c (\text{sym } P)_{13} \\ c (\text{sym } P)_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{11} \\ (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{22} \\ (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{33} \\ c (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{23} \\ c (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{13} \\ c (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{12} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (56)$$

The coefficient c depends on the notation used (2 for Voigt notation [82, 83], $\sqrt{2}$ for Mandel notation [45]).

The components of the defined mapping $\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij}$ can be represented as 3×3 matrices once fixing the index α , such as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_{1ij} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathfrak{M}_{2ij} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathfrak{M}_{3ij} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathfrak{M}_{4ij} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{c}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{c}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathfrak{M}_{5ij} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{c}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{c}{2} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathfrak{M}_{6ij} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{c}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{c}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

We define the inverse operator $\mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^6 \rightarrow \text{Sym}(3)$ such that:

$$(\text{sym } \nabla u)_{ij} = \mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} \varepsilon_\alpha, \quad (\text{sym } P)_{ij} = \mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} \beta_\alpha, \quad (58)$$

and that has the following property:

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \mathfrak{M}_{ij\beta}^{-1} = \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (59)$$

where $\tilde{\delta}$ is the Kronecker δ in $\mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^6$. It is possible to show that the components of the inverse operator are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_{ij1}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathfrak{M}_{ij2}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathfrak{M}_{ij3}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathfrak{M}_{ij4}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{c} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{c} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathfrak{M}_{ij5}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{c} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{c} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathfrak{M}_{ij6}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{c} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{c} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

The mapping $\mathfrak{M}$ has zeros everywhere except in the components $\{111, 222, 333, 423, 513, 612\}$. Therefore, it is possible to express it compactly as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} &= \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 1} \delta_{i1} \delta_{j1} + \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 2} \delta_{i2} \delta_{j2} + \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 3} \delta_{i3} \delta_{j3} + \frac{c}{2} \left(\tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 4} (\delta_{i2} \delta_{j3} + \delta_{i3} \delta_{j2}) + \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 5} (\delta_{i1} \delta_{j3} + \delta_{i3} \delta_{j1}) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{c}{2} \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 6} (\delta_{i1} \delta_{j2} + \delta_{i2} \delta_{j1}). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Analogously for the inverse $\mathfrak{M}^{-1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} = & \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 1} \delta_{i1} \delta_{j1} + \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 2} \delta_{i2} \delta_{j2} + \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 3} \delta_{i3} \delta_{j3} + \frac{1}{c} \left(\tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 4} (\delta_{i2} \delta_{j3} + \delta_{i3} \delta_{j2}) + \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 5} (\delta_{i1} \delta_{j3} + \delta_{i3} \delta_{j1}) \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{c} \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha 6} (\delta_{i1} \delta_{j2} + \delta_{i2} \delta_{j1}).\end{aligned}\quad (62)$$

It is possible to check that applying the linear mapping $\mathfrak{M}$ to a symmetric second order tensor s_{ij} has as a result a vector in $\mathbb{R}^6$ whose first 3 components are the elements s_{11} , s_{22} and s_{33} , while its last 3 components are $c s_{23}$, $c s_{13}$ and $c s_{12}$ respectively. This is in accordance to classically used notation recalled in equation (56).

Now, if we consider a quadratic energy in $\varepsilon - \beta$ we can always express it as:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\varepsilon_\alpha - \beta_\alpha) (\varepsilon_\beta - \beta_\beta) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\alpha\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{ij} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl}. \quad (63)$$

Here, $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e : \mathbb{R}^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^6$ is a general second order symmetric tensor on $\mathbb{R}^{6 \times 6}$ (matrix), with 21 independent coefficients.

Comparing eq. (63) with the corresponding part of (53), i.e.:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{ij} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} = \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\alpha\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{ij} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl},\end{aligned}\quad (64)$$

we must have:

$$(\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} = \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\alpha\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl}. \quad (65)$$

For what follows, it is useful to remark that:

$$(\mathbb{C}_e)^{-1}_{ijkl} = \mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{kl\beta}^{-1}. \quad (66)$$

This last relationship is not trivial and it is proven in the appendix. On the other hand, the converse relationships read:

$$\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\alpha\beta} = \mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} \mathfrak{M}_{kl\beta}^{-1}, \quad \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} = \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl}. \quad (67)$$

With reference to (67) and recalling expression (62) for the components of $\mathfrak{M}^{-1}$, it can be recognized that the second order tensor $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e$ can be written as a function of the components of the fourth order tensor $\mathbb{C}_e$ as:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1111} & (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1122} & (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1133} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1123} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1113} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1112} \\ (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2211} & (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2222} & (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2233} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2223} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2213} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2212} \\ (\mathbb{C}_e)_{3311} & (\mathbb{C}_e)_{3322} & (\mathbb{C}_e)_{3333} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{3323} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{3313} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{3312} \\ \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2311} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2322} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2333} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2323} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2313} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{2312} \\ \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1311} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1322} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1333} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1323} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1313} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1312} \\ \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1211} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1222} & \frac{1}{c} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1233} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1223} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1213} & \frac{1}{c^2} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{1212} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (68)$$

which is a symmetric 6×6 matrix due to the symmetries of $\mathbb{C}_e$ according to which

$$(\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} = (\mathbb{C}_e)_{klij}. \quad (69)$$

In the same fashion we have the identifications:

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} &= \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl}, & (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})_{ijkl} &= \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl}, \\ (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1}_{ijkl} &= \mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \right)_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{kl\beta}^{-1}, & (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})^{-1}_{ijkl} &= \mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{kl\beta}^{-1},\end{aligned}\quad (70)$$

and, conversely:

$$\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}\right)_{\alpha\beta} = \mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} \mathfrak{M}_{kl\beta}^{-1}, \quad \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}\right)_{\alpha\beta} = \mathfrak{M}_{ij\alpha}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})_{ijkl} \mathfrak{M}_{kl\beta}^{-1}, \quad (71)$$

$$\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}\right)_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} = \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl}, \quad \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}\right)_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} = \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})_{ijkl}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl}. \quad (72)$$

5.2 Skew-symmetric terms - rotational coupling

We may always represent the 4th order tensor $\mathbb{C}_c : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$ acting on skew-symmetric matrices in its version acting on axial vectors only, i.e. we write:

$$\langle \mathbb{C}_c \text{ skew}(X), \text{ skew}(X) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} = \langle \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X)), \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}, \quad (73)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is a symmetric second order tensor (since appearing in a quadratic form). Therefore, $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$ has only 6 independent coefficient and so has $\mathbb{C}_c$. Given a second order tensor X , it can be verified that:

$$\|\text{ skew}(X)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}^2 = 2 \|\text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X))\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}^2. \quad (74)$$

Before understanding the general anisotropic character of the coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ we recall the transformation behavior of the energy expression in the isotropic case. An energy defined on second order tensors is isotropic if the transformation:

$$X \rightarrow Q^T \cdot X \cdot Q \quad \text{for } Q \in \text{SO}(3), \quad (75)$$

does not affect the value of the energy. More precisely, we say that a local energy contribution acting on second order tensors is isotropic if

$$W(X) = W(Q^T \cdot X \cdot Q). \quad (76)$$

Given a second order tensor which is subjected to the transformation (75), it is clear that its skew-symmetric part transforms as follows:

$$\text{ skew}(X) \rightarrow \text{ skew}(Q^T \cdot X \cdot Q) = Q^T \cdot \text{ skew}(X) \cdot Q \quad \text{for } Q \in \text{SO}(3), \quad (77)$$

and the corresponding axial vector of $\text{ skew}(X)$ satisfies the transformation law:

$$\text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X)) \rightarrow \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(Q^T \cdot X \cdot Q)) = \text{ axl}(Q^T \cdot \text{ skew}(X) \cdot Q) = Q \cdot \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X)), \quad (78)$$

see [53, 54]. Based on these transformation-laws, we may investigate anisotropy of the rotational coupling with the representation in terms of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$. Indeed, for isotropy of energy of the type $W(\text{ skew}X)$ we require the invariance:

$$\forall Q \in \text{SO}(3) : \quad \langle \mathbb{C}_c \text{ skew}(X), \text{ skew}(X) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} = \langle \mathbb{C}_c \text{ skew}(Q^T \cdot X \cdot Q), \text{ skew}(Q^T \cdot X \cdot Q) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}, \quad (79)$$

which, recalling (73) and (78) is also equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall Q \in \text{SO}(3) : \quad & \langle \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \cdot \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X)), \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \\ &= \langle \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \cdot \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(Q^T \cdot X \cdot Q)), \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(Q^T \cdot X \cdot Q)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \\ &= \langle \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \cdot Q \cdot \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X)), Q \cdot \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

If we now set $\eta = \text{ axl}(\text{ skew}(X))$, the latter is equivalent to:

$$\forall Q \in \text{SO}(3) : \quad \langle \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \cdot \eta, \eta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} = \langle \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \cdot Q \cdot \eta, Q \cdot \eta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} = \langle Q^T \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \cdot Q \eta, \eta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}, \quad (81)$$

where the transformation laws for the axl -operator given in (78) has also been used. Since (81) must hold for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we obtain:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c = Q^T \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \cdot Q \quad \forall Q \in \text{SO}(3). \quad (82)$$

Recalling that $Q \in \text{SO}(3)$ implies $Q^T = Q^{-1}$ it can be inferred that this last equation is satisfied if and only if:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c = \frac{\mu_c}{2} \mathbf{1}, \quad \mu_c \geq 0, \quad (83)$$

which is the expression of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$ for the isotropic case in which μ_c is called the **Cosserat couple modulus** [12]. Let us first state again that the relaxed micromorphic model is fully functional even without using $\mathbb{C}_c$ at all. However, our experience in the isotropic case, in which $\mathbb{C}_c$ reduces to the Cosserat couple modulus μ_c , has shown that in order to describe complete frequency band gaps, one should take $\mu_c > 0$. In the anisotropic case this would translate into the requirement that $\mathbb{C}_c$ is positive definite.

Next, we discuss the different anisotropy classes for $\mathbb{C}_c$ that can be expressed more easily for $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$. In this case we discuss the solutions of:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c = Q^T \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \cdot Q \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{G}\text{-symmetry group of the material.} \quad (84)$$

In other words, the invariance condition is formally equivalent to that previously discussed (see eq. (75)) but the difference stays in the set $\mathcal{G}$ in which the transformation matrix Q lives. Depending on the symmetry properties of the group $\mathcal{G}$, we will be able to define different material classes.

It can be shown that in the respective case of triclinic, monoclinic, orthorhombic, tetragonal (coincides with transversely isotropy) and isotropy (equivalent to cubic symmetry) the tensor $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$ has the following forms (see [42, p. 30] and [7])¹³:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{tric}} &= \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{11} & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{21} & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{31} \\ & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{22} & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{23} \\ \text{sym} & & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{33} \end{pmatrix}, & \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{mono}} &= \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{11} & 0 & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{31} \\ & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{22} & 0 \\ \text{sym} & & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{orth}} &= \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{22} & 0 \\ \text{sym} & & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{33} \end{pmatrix}, & \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{tetr}} = \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{trans}} &= \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{11} & 0 \\ \text{sym} & & (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{iso}} = \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{cubic}} &= (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c)_{11} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 \\ \text{sym} & & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Considering the representation (85) we appreciate that there is no difference between the cubic and isotropic rotational coupling. Both reduce $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$ to be a spherical tensor $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c = \frac{\mu_c}{2} \mathbf{1}$, with $\mu_c \geq 0$. We believe that it is very difficult to make statements about the anisotropic rotational coupling, see the footnote 10. A method to reduce any given anisotropic rotational coupling to the isotropic case is therefore to simply project $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}$ to its isotropic part, given by the **arithmetic mean** of the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}$ (the Voigt bound):

$$\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) := \frac{1}{3} \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) \mathbf{1}. \quad (86)$$

This defines a mapping $\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} : \text{Sym}^+(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \mathbf{1}$. We note, however, that applying (86) has certain deficiency, e.g. it is not stable under inversion:

$$\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} \left(\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right)^{-1} \right) \neq \left[\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) \right]^{-1}. \quad (87)$$

¹³The most general representation of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c \in \text{Sym}^+(3)$ is $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c = \text{dev}(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c) + \frac{1}{3} \text{tr}(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c) \mathbf{1}$. However, this has nothing to do with isotropy: it is just a convenient representation for general symmetric $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$. We note in passing that $\text{dev} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$ alone cannot be positive definite since $\text{tr}(\text{dev} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c) = 0$, such that there are positive and negative eigenvalues of $\text{dev} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c$.

It is possible, following the approach by Norris and Moakher [51], to obtain the closest isotropic tensor to $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}$ with respect to a geodesic structure on $\text{Sym}^+(3)$. This will define a nonlinear operator $\text{iso}_{\text{geod}} : \text{Sym}^+(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \mathbf{1}$ such that:

$$\text{iso}_{\text{geod}} \left(\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right)^{-1} \right) = \left[\text{iso}_{\text{geod}} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) \right]^{-1}. \quad (88)$$

This will be exemplified in a different contribution. In the meantime we may alternatively propose a mapping $\text{iso}_{\log} : \text{Sym}^+(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \mathbf{1}$ as:

$$\text{iso}_{\log} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) := e^{\frac{1}{3} \text{tr}(\log(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}))} \mathbf{1} = e^{\frac{1}{3} \log(\det(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}))} \mathbf{1} = e^{\frac{1}{3} \log(\det(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}))} \mathbf{1} = \det \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \mathbf{1}. \quad (89)$$

This is the **geometric mean** of the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}$. This mapping satisfies already

$$\text{iso}_{\log} \left(\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right)^{-1} \right) = \left[\text{iso}_{\log} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) \right]^{-1}. \quad (90)$$

There is also another possibility. We define the harmonic isotropy projector by:

$$\text{iso}_{\text{harm}} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) := \left[\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} \left(\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right)^{-1} \right) \right]^{-1}. \quad (91)$$

This is the **harmonic mean** of the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}$ (the Reuss-bound [6]). All introduced mappings satisfy the projection property:

$$\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} (\gamma^+ \mathbf{1}) = \text{iso}_{\text{geod}} (\gamma^+ \mathbf{1}) = \text{iso}_{\log} (\gamma^+ \mathbf{1}) = \text{iso}_{\text{harm}} (\gamma^+ \mathbf{1}) = \gamma^+ \mathbf{1}. \quad (92)$$

Let us discuss some features of $\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}}$ versus $\text{iso}_{\log}$. Consider a sequence of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},k} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},\infty}$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$ where $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},\infty}$ is **not** positive definite, i.e. some eigenvalue is zero (and $\det(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},\infty}) = 0$). Then:

$$\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},k} \right) = \frac{1}{3} \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},k} \right) \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \frac{1}{3} \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},\infty} \right) \mathbf{1}, \quad (93)$$

is positive definite. The mapping property is such that $\text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} : \text{Sym}^+(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \mathbf{1}$. In contrast, we observe that:

$$\text{iso}_{\log} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},k} \right) = \left(\det \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso},k} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \mathbf{1} \rightarrow 0_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}. \quad (94)$$

Therefore, $\text{iso}_{\log}$ would determine a zero isotropic coupling as soon as eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}}$ vanish. For example

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{iso}_{\text{arithm}} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) = \frac{a_1}{3}, \quad \text{iso}_{\log} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_c^{\text{aniso}} \right) = 0_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}. \quad (95)$$

At the present stage of understanding, however, we do not have extra arguments to use an anisotropic rotational coupling instead of an isotropic one. When possible, an isotropic rotational coupling given by the Cosserat couple modulus μ_c should be preferred.

6 The macroscopic limit of the relaxed model ($L_c \rightarrow 0$) - macroscopic consistency conditions

6.1 Equilibrium equations

The equilibrium equations of the anisotropic relaxed micromorphic model associated to the energy (8) read:

$$\text{Div} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P)] = 0, \quad (96)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P) \\ & - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P - \mu L_c^2 (\text{Curl Curl } P) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

or in index notation:

$$\left[(\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} + (\mathbb{C}_c)_{ijkl} (\text{skew}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} \right]_{,j} = 0, \quad (97)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} + (\mathbb{C}_c)_{ijkl} (\text{skew}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} \\ & - (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} (\text{sym} P)_{kl} - \mu L_c^2 (P_{ik,jk} - P_{ij,kk}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We define the elastic stress tensor $\sigma(\nabla u, P)$ appearing in (96)₁ as:

$$\sigma(\nabla u, P) := \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P), \quad (98)$$

or in index notation:

$$\sigma_{ij}(\nabla u, P) := (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} + (\mathbb{C}_c)_{ijkl} (\text{skew}(\nabla u - P))_{kl}. \quad (99)$$

Therefore, the equilibrium equation (96)₁ can be compactly written as:

$$\text{Div}[\sigma(\nabla u, P)] = 0. \quad (100)$$

6.2 The general relaxed anisotropic case in the limit $L_c \rightarrow 0$

We will show that our relaxed micromorphic model defined by the energy (8) or equivalently by the equations of motion (96) can be reduced to a sort of equivalent “macroscopic model” when letting $L_c \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, when $L_c = 0$ equation (96)₂ gives a direct relationship between P and ∇u which, inserted in (96)₁ allows to rewrite the energy in terms of ∇u . Hence, we can think to introduce an equivalent macroscopic stress tensor $\sigma_{\text{macro}}(\text{sym} \nabla u)$ which is the limit of $\sigma(\nabla u, P)$ for $L_c \rightarrow 0$. In formulas:

$$\sigma_{\text{macro}}(\text{sym} \nabla u) = \lim_{L_c \rightarrow 0} \sigma(\nabla u, P). \quad (101)$$

The tensor $\sigma_{\text{macro}}(\text{sym} \nabla u)$ can be written as:

$$\sigma_{\text{macro}}(\text{sym} \nabla u) = \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \text{sym} \nabla u, \quad (102)$$

assuming that it is the Cauchy stress tensor of a classical first gradient continuum.

Considering very large samples of the anisotropic structure amounts to letting L_c , the characteristic length, tend to zero. As a consequence of $L_c = 0$, the second equilibrium equation in (96) loses the $\text{Curl Curl } P$ -term and turns into an algebraic side condition connecting P and ∇u via:

$$\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P) = 0, \quad (103)$$

that in index notation reads:

$$(\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} - (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} (\text{sym} P)_{kl} + (\mathbb{C}_c)_{ijkl} (\text{skew}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} = 0. \quad (104)$$

Equation (103) can be decoupled (by the assumed special mapping symmetry properties of the elasticity tensors, see equations (11)) into two equations for the symmetric and skew-symmetric part, respectively, yielding:

$$\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - P) = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P, \quad \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P) = 0. \quad (105)$$

that in index notation becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} (\text{sym}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} = (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} (\text{sym} P)_{kl}, \\ & (\mathbb{C}_c)_{ijkl} (\text{skew}(\nabla u - P))_{kl} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

This uncoupling is true since $\mathbb{C}_e, \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ map symmetric matrices to symmetric matrices and $\mathbb{C}_c : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$, and then $\mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(\nabla u - P)$ is skew-symmetric by assumption. From the second equation in (105), we can easily derive that:

$$\mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} \nabla u = \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (P). \quad (107)$$

We solve (105)₁ for $\text{sym} P$ obtaining¹⁴:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e) \text{sym} P &= \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} \nabla u, \\ \iff \text{sym} P &= (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e)^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} \nabla u). \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

This is an identification between the micro-distortion P and the gradient of the displacement ∇u that proves how, in the macroscopic limiting case, the model is transparent with respect to the micro-distortion. We insert (105)₁ and (108) into (96) and considering the uncoupling between symmetric and skew symmetric parts of the involved tensors, we get:

$$\text{Div} [\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P] = 0 \iff \text{Div} \left[\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e)^{-1} \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} \nabla u \right] = 0, \quad (109)$$

$$\mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P) = 0.$$

On the other hand, the classical balance equation for the linear elastic macroscopic response is:

$$\text{Div} [\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \text{sym} \nabla u] = 0. \quad (110)$$

Comparing the macroscopic balance equation (110) with the one derived from our relaxed model when letting $L_c = 0$ ((109)₁), we obtain the following **a priori identification** between the macroscopic elasticity tensor $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ and the microscopic tensor $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ as well as the mesoscopic (relative) elasticity tensor $\mathbb{C}_e$:

$$\boxed{\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} := \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e)^{-1} \mathbb{C}_e,} \quad (111)$$

which is a generalization of (50) when considering our anisotropic setting. From equation (111) (see section 6.5), we get by simple inversion:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}^{-1} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e) \mathbb{C}_e^{-1} = \mathbb{C}_e^{-1} + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1}. \quad (112)$$

Therefore, we note, surprisingly at first glance, that $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ is the “parallel sum” of $\mathbb{C}_e$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ (the parallel sum of two tensors A and B is defined as $(A^{-1} + B^{-1})^{-1}$), that is equal to one half of the **harmonic mean operator** on positive definite symmetric matrices (see [4, p. 103]) defined as:

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}_e, \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}) := \left[\frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{C}_e^{-1} + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1}) \right]^{-1} = 2 \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \mathbb{C}_e = 2 \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}. \quad (113)$$

It is possible to obtain the inverse relationship with algebraic operations. First, from equation (112) it is immediate to obtain:

$$\mathbb{C}_e^{-1} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}^{-1} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1}, \quad (114)$$

and therefore:

$$\mathbb{C}_e = (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}^{-1} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1})^{-1} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \left[\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}^{-1} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1})^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}^{-1} \right] \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}. \quad (115)$$

Considering that $(A \cdot B \cdot C)^{-1} = C^{-1} \cdot B^{-1} \cdot A^{-1}$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}_e &= \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \left[\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}^{-1} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1}) \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \right]^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \\ &= \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} [\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}]^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}. \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

¹⁴We note here that the inverse of an elastic stiffness tensor, like $(\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e)$ has the same symmetry group structure as $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e$ itself. This can be shown easily by directly looking at the definition with groups.

So finally we have the further compact a priori identification:

$$\boxed{\mathbb{C}_e = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} .} \quad (117)$$

Note that these results are true without assuming that the tensors $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$, $\mathbb{C}_e$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ commute (and, in fact, they do not).

6.3 Particularization for specific symmetries

In order to show how the relationship (111) particularizes in specific cases, we use the vectorial notation defined in section (5). In particular, considering the relationship (111) and the formulas (65) and (66) it is possible to write:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl} &= \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \right)_{\alpha\gamma} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma mn} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} + \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\delta\epsilon}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{mn\delta}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma pq}^{-1} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\zeta\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\zeta pq} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl} \\ &= \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \right)_{\alpha\gamma} \delta_{\gamma\delta} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} + \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\delta\epsilon}^{-1} \delta_{\epsilon\zeta} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\zeta\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl} \\ &= \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \right)_{\alpha\gamma} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} + \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\gamma\zeta}^{-1} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{\zeta\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl} . \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

From this last relationship it is easy to notice that:

$$\boxed{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} = \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \cdot \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} + \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e .} \quad (119)$$

This formula for second-order elasticity tensors is completely analogous to (111) obtained for the the 4th order tensors and allows to pass from micro to macro coefficients just specifying the special forms of the 6×6 matrices $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}$, $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}$, $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e$. Considering algebraic passages analogous to the 4th order tensors case, it is possible to obtain the inverse relationship:

$$\boxed{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e = \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \cdot \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} - \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} .} \quad (120)$$

These formulas may be of use when knowing the elastic properties $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}$ of a unit elementary cell of the considered metamaterial and the macroscopic properties $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}$ of the metamaterial considered as a macroscopic block. Therefore, the elastic coupling tensor $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e$ results to be easily computable and is, in fact uniquely determined. In the following subsections, we will particularize formulas (119) and (120) to specific symmetries, so dealing with isotropic, cubic, orthotropic and generally anisotropic material, as intended in our relaxed micromorphic framework. For deriving such particular cases, we make the implicit assumption that $\mathbb{C}_e$, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ belong to the same class of symmetry which is indeed a sensible ansatz.

6.3.1 The isotropic case

In the isotropic case and considering the Voigt notation, the constitutive elastic tensor has the specific structure:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e^{\text{iso}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2\mu_e + \lambda_e & \lambda_e & \lambda_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_e & 2\mu_e + \lambda_e & \lambda_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_e & \lambda_e & 2\mu_e + \lambda_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e \end{pmatrix}, \quad (121)$$

that considering the bulk modulus $\kappa_e = \frac{1}{3}(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e)$ can be expressed as:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e^{\text{iso}} = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_e - 4/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e - 4/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e - 4/3 \mu_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e \end{pmatrix}. \quad (122)$$

Analogously:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{iso}} = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_{\text{micro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{micro}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{micro}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (123)$$

Using the consistency condition in equation (119) and simplifying, it is possible to obtain:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}^{\text{iso}} = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_{\text{macro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{macro}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{macro}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (124)$$

where we set:

$$\kappa_{\text{macro}} = \frac{\kappa_e \kappa_{\text{micro}}}{\kappa_e + \kappa_{\text{micro}}}, \quad \mu_{\text{macro}} = \frac{\mu_e \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}}. \quad (125)$$

The relationship for κ_{macro} can also be expressed in function of μ_{macro} and λ_{macro} as:

$$(2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}}) = \frac{(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}})(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e)}{(2(\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}) + 3(\lambda_e + \lambda_{\text{micro}}))}. \quad (126)$$

Equations (125) can also be inversed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_e &= \frac{\kappa_{\text{macro}} \kappa_{\text{micro}}}{\kappa_{\text{micro}} - \kappa_{\text{macro}}} = \kappa_{\text{macro}} (\kappa_{\text{micro}} - \kappa_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \kappa_{\text{micro}}, \\ \mu_e &= \frac{\mu_{\text{macro}} \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_{\text{micro}} - \mu_{\text{macro}}} = \mu_{\text{macro}} (\mu_{\text{micro}} - \mu_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \mu_{\text{micro}}. \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

The first of equations (127) can be analogously rewritten in terms of λ_e and μ_e as:

$$(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e) = \frac{(2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}})(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}})}{(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}}) - (2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}})}. \quad (128)$$

6.3.2 The cubic symmetry case

In the cubic case the constitutive tensors in Voigt-format have the specific structure:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e^{\text{iso}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2\mu_e + \lambda_e & \lambda_e & \lambda_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_e & 2\mu_e + \lambda_e & \lambda_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_e & \lambda_e & 2\mu_e + \lambda_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (129)$$

that considering the bulk modulus $\kappa_e = \frac{1}{3}(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e)$ can be expressed as:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e^{\text{iso}} = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_e - 4/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e - 4/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e + 2/3 \mu_e & \kappa_e - 4/3 \mu_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_e^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (130)$$

Analogously:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{iso}} = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_{\text{micro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & \kappa_{\text{micro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{micro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{micro}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{micro}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{micro}}^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (131)$$

Using the consistency condition in equation (119), it is possible to obtain:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}^{\text{iso}} = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_{\text{macro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} + 2/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & \kappa_{\text{macro}} - 4/3 \mu_{\text{macro}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{macro}}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{macro}}^* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_{\text{macro}}^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (132)$$

where:

$$\boxed{\kappa_{\text{macro}} = \frac{\kappa_e \kappa_{\text{micro}}}{\kappa_e + \kappa_{\text{micro}}}, \quad \mu_{\text{macro}} = \frac{\mu_e \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}}, \quad \mu_{\text{macro}}^* = \frac{\mu_e^* \mu_{\text{micro}}^*}{\mu_e^* + \mu_{\text{micro}}^*}.} \quad (133)$$

The relationship for κ_{macro} can also be expressed in function of μ_{macro} and λ_{macro} as:

$$(2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}}) = \frac{(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}})(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e)}{(2(\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}) + 3(\lambda_e + \lambda_{\text{micro}}))}. \quad (134)$$

Equations (133) can also be inversed as:

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \kappa_e &= \frac{\kappa_{\text{macro}} \kappa_{\text{micro}}}{\kappa_{\text{micro}} - \kappa_{\text{macro}}} = \kappa_{\text{macro}} (\kappa_{\text{micro}} - \kappa_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \kappa_{\text{micro}}, \\ \mu_e &= \frac{\mu_{\text{macro}} \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_{\text{micro}} - \mu_{\text{macro}}} = \mu_{\text{macro}} (\mu_{\text{micro}} - \mu_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \mu_{\text{micro}}, \\ \mu_e^* &= \frac{\mu_{\text{macro}}^* \mu_{\text{micro}}^*}{\mu_{\text{micro}}^* - \mu_{\text{macro}}^*} = \mu_{\text{macro}}^* (\mu_{\text{micro}}^* - \mu_{\text{macro}}^*)^{-1} \mu_{\text{micro}}^*. \end{aligned}} \quad (135)$$

The first of equations (135) can be analogously rewritten in terms of λ_e and μ_e as:

$$(2\mu_e + 3\lambda_e) = \frac{(2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}})(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}})}{(2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}}) - (2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}})}. \quad (136)$$

6.3.3 The orthotropic case

In the orthotropic case the constitutive tensors have the specific structure:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e^{\text{orth}} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{11} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{12} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{12} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{22} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{23} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{13} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{23} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{44} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{55} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{T}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{66} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (137)$$

Since it will be useful in the following, we define the sub-block $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e^a$ as:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e^{\mathbf{a}} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{11} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{12} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{13} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{21} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{22} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{23} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{31} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{32} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_e \end{pmatrix}_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad (138)$$

Analogously:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{orth}} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{11} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{12} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{12} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{22} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{23} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{13} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{23} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{44} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{55} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{66} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (139)$$

and we define, for the subsequent convenience, the sub-block $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{a}}$ as:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{a}} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{11} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{12} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{13} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{21} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{22} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{23} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{31} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{32} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{micro}} \end{pmatrix}_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (140)$$

Using the consistency condition in equation (119), it is possible to obtain:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}}^{\text{orth}} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{11} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{12} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{12} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{22} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{23} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{13} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{23} & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{44} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{55} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{macro}} \end{pmatrix}_{66} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (141)$$

where, considering $p = 4, 5, 6$ without the sum over repeated indexes, we have:

$$\boxed{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}^{\text{a}} = \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e^{\text{a}} \cdot \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e^{\text{a}} + \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{a}} \right)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{a}}, \quad \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{pp} = \frac{\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{pp} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \right)_{pp}}{\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e + \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \right)_{pp}}.} \quad (142)$$

Here, we clearly introduced the sub-block $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}^{\text{a}}$ as:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}^{\text{a}} = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{11} & \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{12} & \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{13} \\ \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{12} & \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{22} & \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{23} \\ \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{13} & \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{23} & \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{33} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The formulas in equation (142) can also be inversed as:

$$\boxed{\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e^{\text{a}} = \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}^{\text{a}} \cdot \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{a}} - \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}}^{\text{a}} \right)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}}^{\text{a}}, \quad \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e \right)_{pp} = \frac{\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{pp} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} \right)_{pp}}{\left(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{micro}} - \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_{\text{macro}} \right)_{pp}}.} \quad (143)$$

6.4 The long wavelength limit - dynamic considerations

The dynamical equilibrium equations for the anisotropic relaxed micromorphic model take the form:

$$\rho u_{,tt} = \text{Div} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P)], \quad (144)$$

$$\rho \hat{L}_c^2 \mathbb{J}_0 P_{,tt} = \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P) - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P - \mu L_c^2 \text{Curl Curl} P.$$

Using the isotropy of inertia we can split (144)₂ into 3 coupled systems of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1 \rho \hat{L}_c^2 \text{dev sym} [P_{,tt}] &= \text{dev sym} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P - \mu L_c^2 \text{Curl Curl} P], \\ \eta_2 \rho \hat{L}_c^2 \text{skew} [P_{,tt}] &= \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P) - \mu L_c^2 \text{skew Curl Curl} P, \\ \eta_3 \rho \hat{L}_c^2 \text{tr} [P_{,tt}] &= \text{tr} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P - \mu L_c^2 \text{Curl Curl} P]. \end{aligned} \quad (145)$$

The classical continuum theory is the **long wavelength limit**, corresponding to large length and time scales, and it does predict properties independent of specimen size. The long wave length limit is given by letting simultaneously $\hat{L}_c, L_c \rightarrow 0$. In this case, formally, the system (144) reduces to:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho u_{,tt} &= \text{Div} [\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P)], \\ 0 &= \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} (\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} (\nabla u - P) - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} P. \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

As in the static case, we may rewrite (146) in the format of classical dynamic linear elasticity, yielding:

$$\rho u_{,tt} = \text{Div} [\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \text{sym} \nabla u], \quad (147)$$

where, following (111), we obtain again:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e)^{-1} \mathbb{C}_e. \quad (148)$$

6.5 Properties of the resulting constitutive tensors

6.5.1 Symmetry

Let us first consider the direct relationship:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e)^{-1} \mathbb{C}_e. \quad (149)$$

The constitutive tensor $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ is the result of a product of the type:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} = A (A + B)^{-1} B, \quad (150)$$

where A , B and, as a consequence $(A + B)$ are symmetric. In order to show the symmetry of $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ let us consider that $(A + B)$ is invertible and write accordingly:

$$(A + B) (A + B)^{-1} B = B. \quad (151)$$

It is possible to decompose the product considering the distributive property of the matrix product with respect to the sum in:

$$A (A + B)^{-1} B + B (A + B)^{-1} B = B. \quad (152)$$

And therefore:

$$A (A + B)^{-1} B = B - B (A + B)^{-1} B. \quad (153)$$

So we have that $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} = A (A + B)^{-1} B$ is the difference of two symmetric matrices since $B (A + B)^{-1} B$ is also symmetric.¹⁵ For the inverse relationship, we consider:

$$\mathbb{C}_e = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}. \quad (154)$$

It is possible to derive its symmetry (as long as $(\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})^{-1}$ exists) considering similarly:

$$A (A - B)^{-1} B = B + B (A - B)^{-1} B. \quad (155)$$

6.5.2 Positive definiteness

Let us now investigate the positive-definiteness of

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e)^{-1} \mathbb{C}_e. \quad (156)$$

If we consider $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ and $\mathbb{C}_e$ positive definite it follows, from the properties of positive definiteness, that their sum and again the inverse of the sum will be positive definite. Note first that a product AB of positive definite matrices A and B has real, positive eigenvalues, since considering the characteristic equation:

$$\det(AB - \lambda \mathbb{1}) = 0 \iff \det(A^{-1/2}[AB - \lambda \mathbb{1}]A^{1/2}) = 0 \iff \det(A^{1/2}BA^{1/2} - \lambda \mathbb{1}) = 0, \quad (157)$$

and $A^{1/2}BA^{1/2}$ is positive definite since defining $\eta := A^{1/2}\xi$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A^{1/2}BA^{1/2}\xi, \xi \rangle &= \langle BA^{1/2}\xi, A^{1/2}\xi \rangle = \langle B\eta, \eta \rangle \geq \lambda_{\min}(B) \|\eta\|^2 = \lambda_{\min}(B) \|A^{1/2}\xi\|^2 \\ &= \lambda_{\min}(B) \langle A^{1/2}\xi, A^{1/2}\xi \rangle = \lambda_{\min}(B) \langle A\xi, \xi \rangle \geq \lambda_{\min}(B) \lambda_{\min}(A) \|\xi\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

Therefore, the eigenvalues of AB are real and positive. However, in general, the symmetry of the product AB will be lost. In our case, nonetheless, we proved in subsection 6.5.1 that $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ is symmetric and, therefore, it is positive definite.

¹⁵We note again that the inverse of a positive definite tensor, like $A + B = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e$ has the same symmetry group structure as $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e$ itself. This can be shown easily by directly looking at the definition with groups.

For the inverse relationship, we consider:

$$\mathbb{C}_e = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}. \quad (159)$$

In this case, in order to obtain the positive definiteness of $\mathbb{C}_e$ it is not enough to assume that $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ are positive definite. However, one sufficient condition to add is that $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ is also positive definite. This property can be thought of as a generalization of the condition found in the isotropic case in which:

smaller is stiffer the macroscopic elastic response cannot be equal or stiffer than the microscopic response $\mu_{\text{micro}} > \mu_{\text{macro}}, \quad (2\mu_{\text{micro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{micro}}) > (2\mu_{\text{macro}} + 3\lambda_{\text{macro}}).$

7 Non reduction for the standard Mindlin-Eringen model

The elastic energy of the general anisotropic micromorphic model in the sense of Mindlin-Eringen can be represented as:

$$W = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - P), (\nabla u - P) \rangle}_{\text{anisotropic elastic - energy}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym } P, \text{sym } P \rangle}_{\text{micro - self - energy}} + \underbrace{\frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \|\nabla P\|^2}_{\text{curvature}}. \quad (160)$$

The same in index notation:

$$W = \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{ijkl} (\nabla u - P)_{ij} (\nabla u - P)_{kl} + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} (\text{sym } P)_{ij} (\text{sym } P)_{kl} + \frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} P_{ij,k} P_{ij,k}. \quad (161)$$

Here, we have immediately discarded $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{cross}}$ for simplicity. Note that the coupling of skew-symmetric terms is now also contained in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e$ in some hidden way, instead than explicitly present as in $\mathbb{C}_c$ and our relaxed model. The static equilibrium equations are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Div} [\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - P)] &= 0, \\ -\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - P) + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym } P + \mu L_c^2 \text{Div} [\nabla P] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (162)$$

That can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \left((\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{ijkl} (\nabla u - P)_{kl} \right)_{,i} &= 0, \\ -(\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{ijkl} (\nabla u - P)_{kl} + (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} (\text{sym } P)_{kl} + \mu L_c^2 P_{ij,kk} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (163)$$

Here we can define the elastic (relative) stress depending bijectively on the non-symmetric elastic distortion $e = \nabla u - P$ since $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e$ is assumed to be uniformly positive definite:

$$\sigma(\nabla u, P) = \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - P), \quad \sigma_{kl}(\nabla u, P) = (\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{ijkl} (\nabla u - P)_{kl}. \quad (164)$$

We can write in this model:

$$\nabla u - P = \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e^{-1} \sigma, \quad (165)$$

where $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e^{-1}$ is the Mindlin-Eringen elastic micromorphic compliance tensor.

In order to find the corresponding macroscopic tensor, we have to write the micromorphic elastic (relative) stress as a function of only ∇u .

Considering very large samples of the anisotropic structure amounts to letting L_c , the characteristic length, tend to zero. As a consequence of $L_c = 0$, the second equilibrium equation in (162) loses the $\text{Div} \nabla P$ -term and turns into an algebraic side condition connecting P and ∇u now via:

$$\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - P) = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym } P. \quad (166)$$

Or again:

$$(\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{ijkl} (\nabla u - P)_{ij} = (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{ijkl} (\text{sym } P)_{ij} . \quad (167)$$

From this equation it is possible to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym } P &= \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } (\nabla u - P) + \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{skew } (\nabla u - P) \\ &= \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } \nabla u - \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } P + \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{skew } (\nabla u - P) , \end{aligned} \quad (168)$$

$$(\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}) \text{sym } P = \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } \nabla u + \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{skew } (\nabla u - P)$$

$$\text{sym } P = (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } \nabla u + (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{skew } (\nabla u - P) .$$

That in index notation becomes:

$$(\text{sym } P)_{ij} = (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1}_{ijkl} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{klmn} (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{mn} + (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1}_{ijkl} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{klmn} (\text{skew } (\nabla u - P))_{mn} . \quad (169)$$

On the other hand, replacing (166) in (162)₁ we obtain:

$$\text{Div } [\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym } P] = 0 . \quad (170)$$

And again replacing the result in (168) we obtain:

$$\text{Div } \left[\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } \nabla u + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{skew } (\nabla u - P) \right] = 0 . \quad (171)$$

It is not possible to decouple this last equation due to the presence of the rotational coupling term $\text{skew } (\nabla u - P)$. Therefore, the only condition we can obtain is:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } \nabla u + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{skew } (\nabla u - P) = \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \text{sym } \nabla u , \quad (172)$$

or in index notation:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{klmn} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1}_{mnpq} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{pqij} (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{ij} + \\ &+ (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{klmn} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1}_{mnpq} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{pqij} (\text{skew } (\nabla u - P))_{ij} = (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})_{klij} (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{ij} . \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

That has to stand for each $\text{sym } \nabla u$. Noting that $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \text{sym } \nabla u \in \text{Sym}(3)$ and considering the symmetric part and the skew-symmetric part individually, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{sym } \left\{ \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } \nabla u + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{skew } (\nabla u - P) \right\} \\ \hspace{15em} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \text{sym } \nabla u , \\ \text{skew } \left\{ \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{sym } \nabla u + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbb{C}}_e \text{skew } (\nabla u - P) \right\} = 0 . \end{array} \right. \quad (174)$$

In index notation we obtain similarly:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{sym } \left\{ (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{klmn} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1}_{mnpq} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{pqij} \left((\text{sym } \nabla u)_{ij} + (\text{skew } (\nabla u - P))_{ij} \right) \right\} \\ \hspace{10em} = (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})_{klij} (\text{sym } \nabla u)_{ij} , \\ \text{skew } \left\{ (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})_{klmn} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1}_{mnpq} (\overline{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{pqij} \left((\text{sym } \nabla u)_{ij} + (\text{skew } (\nabla u - P))_{ij} \right) \right\} = 0 . \end{array} \right. \quad (175)$$

A sufficient condition to obtain a decoupling of these equations (sym and skew) is exactly the reduced anisotropic format put forward for our relaxed model.

8 The microscopic limit - static considerations

There is another interesting limit behavior in our relaxed micromorphic model. We may consider, formally, to let $L_c \rightarrow \infty$. Conceptually, this means a “zoom” into the micro-structure. A scaling argument shows that this is tantamount to considering very small samples of the given multiscale material.

8.1 The standard Mindlin-Eringen model

Letting $L_c \rightarrow \infty$ and considering the curvature-term in the form $\mu L_c^2 \|\nabla P\|^2$ means that, in the limit, $\nabla P \rightarrow 0$ and P must be homogeneous: $P(x) = \hat{P}$. This means that the micro-structure does not have the possibility to respond in any inhomogeneous way. The remaining minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - \hat{P}), (\nabla u - \hat{P}) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P}, \text{sym} \hat{P} \rangle dx \rightarrow \min(u, \hat{P}), \quad \hat{P} \text{ is homogeneous,} \\ & \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \text{Div} [\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - \hat{P})] = 0, & u|_{\partial\Omega} = u_0, \\ -\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - \hat{P}) + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P} = 0, & \hat{P} \text{ is homogeneous,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (176)$$

can be written, considering that $\hat{P}$ is homogeneous, as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - \hat{P}), (\nabla u - \hat{P}) \rangle dx + \frac{|\Omega|}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P}, \text{sym} \hat{P} \rangle \rightarrow \min(u, \hat{P}), \\ & \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \text{Div} [\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \nabla u] = \underbrace{\text{Div} [\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \hat{P}]}_{=0} = 0, & u|_{\partial\Omega} = u_0, \\ \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \hat{P} + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P} = \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \left[\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \nabla u dx \right], & \hat{P} \text{ is homogeneous,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (177)$$

where $|\Omega| = \int_{\Omega} 1 dx$ denotes the measure of Ω and the last equation has been derived considering that the variation with respect to a homogeneous $\hat{P}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e (\nabla u - \hat{P}), -\delta \hat{P} \rangle dx + |\Omega| \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \nabla u, -\delta \hat{P} \rangle dx + \int_{\Omega} \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle dx + |\Omega| \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle \\ &= \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \int_{\Omega} \nabla u dx, -\delta \hat{P} \rangle + |\Omega| \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle + |\Omega| \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle \\ &= \langle \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \int_{\Omega} \nabla u dx + |\Omega| (\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \hat{P} + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P}), \delta \hat{P} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

The problem (177) has a unique solution in the displacement u , from which we determine $\hat{P}$. Defining $\bar{\mathbb{C}} : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ such that:

$$\bar{\mathbb{C}} \hat{P} := \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \hat{P} + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \hat{P} = \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \left[\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \nabla u dx \right], \quad (179)$$

shows that $\bar{\mathbb{C}}$ is invertible. Therefore, we obtain that the value of the homogeneous $\hat{P}$ results as

$$\hat{P} := \bar{\mathbb{C}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbb{C}}_e \left[\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \nabla u dx \right]. \quad (180)$$

In conclusion, the micro-distortion P is uniquely related to the average $\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \nabla u dx$ (over a representative unit cell). However, this relationship is not, in any way, transparent due to the unclear interaction of $\bar{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_e$.

8.2 The relaxed micromorphic model but with $\|\nabla P\|^2$

In this model variant, letting $L_c \rightarrow \infty$, generates again a response similar as before, $P(x) = \hat{P}$ must be homogeneous and the remaining minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym}(\nabla u - \hat{P}), \operatorname{sym}(\nabla u - \hat{P}) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}, \operatorname{sym} \hat{P} \rangle dx \rightarrow \min(u, \hat{P}), \\ & \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \operatorname{Div} [\mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym}(\nabla u - \hat{P})] = 0, & u|_{\partial\Omega} = u_0, \\ -\mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym}(\nabla u - \hat{P}) + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \operatorname{sym} \hat{P} = 0, & \hat{P} \text{ is homogeneous,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (181)$$

can be written, considering that $\hat{P}$ is homogeneous, as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym}(\nabla u - \hat{P}), \operatorname{sym}(\nabla u - \hat{P}) \rangle dx + \frac{|\Omega|}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}, \operatorname{sym} \hat{P} \rangle \rightarrow \min(u, \hat{P}), \\ & \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \operatorname{Div} [\mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym} \nabla u] = \underbrace{\operatorname{Div} [\mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}]}_{=0} = 0, & u|_{\partial\Omega} = u_0, \\ (\mathbb{C}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}) \operatorname{sym} \hat{P} = \mathbb{C}_e \left[\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{sym} \nabla u dx \right], & \hat{P} \text{ is homogeneous,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (182)$$

where $|\Omega| = \int_{\Omega} 1 dx$ and the last equation has been derived considering that the variation with respect to a homogeneous $\hat{P}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym}(\nabla u - \hat{P}), -\delta \hat{P} \rangle dx + |\Omega| \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle \\ & = \int_{\Omega} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym} \nabla u, -\delta \hat{P} \rangle dx + \int_{\Omega} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle dx + |\Omega| \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle \\ & = \langle \mathbb{C}_e \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{sym} \nabla u dx, -\delta \hat{P} \rangle + |\Omega| \langle \mathbb{C}_e \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle + |\Omega| \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle \\ & = \langle \mathbb{C}_e \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{sym} \nabla u dx + |\Omega| (\mathbb{C}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}) \operatorname{sym} \hat{P}, \delta \hat{P} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (183)$$

Since $\delta \hat{P}$ is arbitrary, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{C}_e \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{sym} \nabla u dx + |\Omega| (\mathbb{C}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}) \operatorname{sym} \hat{P} = 0. \quad (184)$$

The problem (182) has a unique solution in the displacement u , from which we determine $\operatorname{sym} \hat{P}$ as:

$$\operatorname{sym} \hat{P} := (\mathbb{C}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \mathbb{C}_e \left[\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{sym} \nabla u dx \right], \quad (185)$$


from which, considering $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_e + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}})^{-1} \mathbb{C}_e$, we can notice that:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \operatorname{sym} \hat{P} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \left[\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{sym} \nabla u dx \right] \quad (186)$$

$$\iff \operatorname{sym} \hat{P} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} \left[\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{sym} \nabla u dx \right]. \quad (187)$$

Since $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} : \operatorname{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \operatorname{Sym}(3)$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} : \operatorname{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \operatorname{Sym}(3)$ we have also that $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1} : \operatorname{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \operatorname{Sym}(3)$ and altogether $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} : \operatorname{Sym}(3) \rightarrow \operatorname{Sym}(3)$. In this case the problem (182) is formally equivalent to the classic elastic first gradient case considering $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}_e$. Since we used $\mathbb{C}_c \equiv 0$, the skew-symmetric part of P remains indeterminate.

Figure 2: Transparent scale-separation between macroscopic Cauchy linear elastic response for $L_c = 0$ with stiffness $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ and microscopic Cauchy linear elastic response for $L_c \rightarrow \infty$ with stiffness $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$. The relaxed micromorphic model “interpolates” between $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ with parameter $L_c = 0 \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ and $L_c = \infty \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$. This clearcut transparency is only obtained within our relaxed micromorphic approach. Thereby, $L_c \rightarrow \infty$ solves only the micro-unit-cell problem while $L_c = 0$ can be interpreted either as making the body Ω arbitrary large while retaining the size of the unit-cell or keeping the dimensions of the body fixed while reducing the dimensions of the unit cell to zero. No condition on the rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ is implied in either case.



8.3 The relaxed micromorphic model with $\|\text{Curl } P\|^2$

In our relaxed micromorphic model with the curvature depending only on $\text{Curl } P$ things turn out much differently. Letting $L_c \rightarrow \infty$ does not generate a homogeneous $\hat{P}$, rather it enforces that the micro-distortion P must be compatible and therefore that there exists a function $\vartheta : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $P(x) = \nabla \vartheta(x)$.

Therefore, the remaining minimization problem is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - \nabla \vartheta), \text{sym}(\nabla u - \nabla \vartheta) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \nabla \vartheta, \text{sym} \nabla \vartheta \rangle dx \rightarrow \min(u, \vartheta), \\ & \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \text{Div}[\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - \nabla \vartheta)] = 0, \\ \text{Div}[-\mathbb{C}_e \text{sym}(\nabla u - \nabla \vartheta) + \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \nabla \vartheta] = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (188)$$

Letting boundary conditions for ϑ aside (i.e. no Dirichlet type boundary condition for P) we get immediately a solution of (188) by choosing throughout $\nabla u = \nabla \vartheta$ that gives:

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \nabla u, \text{sym} \nabla u \rangle dx \rightarrow \min(u) \rightsquigarrow \text{Div}[\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} \text{sym} \nabla u] = 0. \quad (189)$$

Therefore, we generate exactly the classical linear elastic response with the microscopic stiffness $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ for $L_c \rightarrow \infty$, as it should be!

9 Conclusion

Gathering our new findings for the anisotropic relaxed micromorphic model we have obtained that for zero characteristic length scale $L_c = 0$ (which corresponds to a long wavelength limit) it is possible to identify both the symmetric and skew-symmetric part of the micro-distortion P with the gradient of the displacement ∇u as:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e) \text{sym } P &= \mathbb{C}_e \text{sym} \nabla u, \\ \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew}(P) &= \mathbb{C}_c \text{skew} \nabla u. \end{aligned} \quad (190)$$

From this result we obtain that the experimentally observed macroscopic stiffness for an energy-equivalent linear elastic medium has the stiffness tensor:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}_e, \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}) = (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1} + \mathbb{C}_e^{-1})^{-1} = \mathbb{C}_e (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} + \mathbb{C}_e)^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}. \quad (191)$$

Here, $\mathcal{H}$ is the harmonic mean of the elastic (relative) stiffness tensor $\mathbb{C}_e$ and the microscopic stiffness tensor $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ of the relaxed micromorphic model, respectively. It is possible to invert the relation (191) to yield:

$$\mathbb{C}_e = \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} (\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}})^{-1} \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}} = (\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}^{-1} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}^{-1})^{-1}. \quad (192)$$

In (192), the tensor $\mathbb{C}_e$ is determined uniquely to be positive definite provided $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ is positive definite. No similar simple expression is possible for the standard anisotropic Mindlin-Eringen model.

On the other hand, considering $L_c \rightarrow \infty$ we have obtained that our model tends to a classical linear elastic response with the microscopic stiffness $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$. This results allows us to say that we have obtained a transparent scale-separation between the macroscopic linear response with $\mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}$ for $L_c = 0$ and the microscopic linear response $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ for $L_c \rightarrow \infty$. The intermediate cases can be interpreted as an “interpolation” between the macro and the micro-behavior obtained for $L_c > 0$.

We remark that the rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$ is not in any way related to either the macroscopic or microscopic measurable quantities, in sharp contrast to $\mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}, \mathbb{C}_{\text{macro}}, \mathbb{C}_e$.

Our novel a priori macroscopic consistency condition (191) in effect reduces the burden of determining constitutive coefficients dramatically. Essentially, only the length-scale related moduli in $\mathbb{L}_e$ and $\mathbb{L}_c$ need to be determined, together with the non-essential rotational coupling tensor $\mathbb{C}_c$. For all other coefficients $\mathbb{C}_e, \mathbb{C}_{\text{micro}}$ standard experimental test or simple ab-initio calculations on the micro-scale suffice.

Furthermore, our presented model allows full use of the well-known Voigt-representation for classical elasticity tensors. Thus we do not need to investigate the anisotropy classes based on 6th-order tensors [1], both for the local energy contribution and the curvature expression. This makes the presented framework all the more attractive.

In a future contribution we will discuss dispersion curves and band gaps for the anisotropic relaxed micromorphic continuum. There is now a need felt to supply special solutions for simple boundary value problems like bending and torsion for the relaxed micromorphic model.

10 References

- [1] Nicolas Auffray. On the algebraic structure of isotropic generalized elasticity theories. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 20(5):565–581, 2015.
- [2] Sebastian Bauer, Patrizio Neff, Dirk Pauly, and Gerhard Starke. Dev-Div-and DevSym-DevCurl-inequalities for incompatible square tensor fields with mixed boundary conditions. *Published online in ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/cocv/2014068>, 2013.
- [3] Sebastian Bauer, Patrizio Neff, Dirk Pauly, and Gerhard Starke. New Poincaré-type inequalities. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 352(2):163–166, 2014.
- [4] Rajendra Bhatia. *Positive definite matrices*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [5] Christian G. Boehmer, Patrizio Neff, and Belgin Seymenoglu. Soliton-like solutions based on geometrically nonlinear Cosserat micropolar elasticity. *Wave Motion*, 60:158–165, 2016.
- [6] Thomas Böhlke and Albrecht Bertram. A minimum problem defining effective isotropic elastic properties. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 80(S2):419–420, 2000.
- [7] Peter Chadwick, Maurizio Vianello, and Stephen C. Cowin. A new proof that the number of linear elastic symmetries is eight. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 49(11):2471–2492, 2001.
- [8] Youping Chen and James D. Lee. Connecting molecular dynamics to micromorphic theory.(I). Instantaneous and averaged mechanical variables. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 322:359–376, 2003.
- [9] Youping Chen and James D. Lee. Determining material constants in micromorphic theory through phonon dispersion relations. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 41(8):871–886, 2003.
- [10] Youping Chen, James D. Lee, and Azim Eskandarian. Atomistic viewpoint of the applicability of microcontinuum theories. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 41(8):2085–2097, 2004.
- [11] William D. Claus Jr. and Ahmed Cemal Eringen. Dislocation dispersion of elastic waves. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 9(7):605–610, 1971.
- [12] Eugène Cosserat and François Cosserat. Théorie des corps déformables (engl. translation by D. Delphenich 2007, pdf available at https://www.uni-due.de/%7ehm0014/Cosserat_files/Cosserat09_eng.pdf). *Librairie Scientifique A. Hermann et Fils, reprint 2009 by Hermann Librairie Scientifique, ISBN 978 27056 6920 1*, 1909.
- [13] Francesco dell’Isola, Giulio Sciarra, and Stefano Vidoli. Generalized Hooke’s law for isotropic second gradient materials. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 465:2177–2196, 2009.
- [14] François Ebobisse and Patrizio Neff. Existence and uniqueness for rate-independent infinitesimal gradient plasticity with isotropic hardening and plastic spin. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 15(6):691–703, 2010.

- [15] François Ebobisse, Patrizio Neff, and Daya Reddy. Existence results in dislocation based rate-independent isotropic gradient plasticity with kinematical hardening and plastic spin: The case with symmetric local backstress. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.01973*, 2015.
- [16] Ahmed Cemal Eringen. *Mechanics of micromorphic materials*. Springer, 1966.
- [17] Ahmed Cemal Eringen. *Microcontinuum field theories*. Springer, 1999.
- [18] Ahmed Cemal Eringen and William D. Claus Jr. A micromorphic approach to dislocation theory and its relation to several existing theories. In *Fundamental aspects of dislocation theory, Volume II. National Bureau of Standards Special. 317(2)*, pages 1023–1040. 1970.
- [19] Ahmed Cemal Eringen and Erdogan S. Suhubi. Nonlinear theory of simple micro-elastic solids - I. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 2(2):189–203, 1964.
- [20] Andreas Fischle and Patrizio Neff. The geometrically nonlinear Cosserat micropolar shear-stretch energy. Part I: A general parameter reduction formula and energy-minimizing microrotations in 2D. *Preprint arXiv:1507.05480, to appear in Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 2015.
- [21] Samuel Forest. Mechanics of generalized continua: construction by homogenization. *Le Journal de Physique IV*, 8(PR4):39–48, 1998.
- [22] Samuel Forest. Homogenization methods and mechanics of generalized continua-Part 2. *Theoretical and Applied Mechanics (Belgrad)*, 28-29:113–144, 2002.
- [23] Samuel Forest. Micromorphic approach for gradient elasticity, viscoplasticity, and damage. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 135(3):117–131, 2009.
- [24] Samuel Forest and Rainer Sievert. Nonlinear microstrain theories. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 43(24):7224–7245, 2006.
- [25] Samuel Forest and Duy Khanh Trinh. Generalized continua and non-homogeneous boundary conditions in homogenisation methods. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 91(2):90–109, 2011.
- [26] Paul Germain. The method of virtual power in continuum mechanics. Part 2: Microstructure. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 25(3):556–575, 1973.
- [27] Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba, Patrizio Neff, Angela Madeo, and Ingo Münch. A variant of the linear isotropic indeterminate couple stress model with symmetric local force-stress, symmetric nonlocal force-stress, symmetric couple-stresses and complete traction boundary conditions. *Preprint arXiv:1504.00868, to appear in Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids, DOI: 10.1177/1081286515625535*, 2015.
- [28] Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba, Patrizio Neff, Angela Madeo, Luca Placidi, and Giuseppe Rosi. The relaxed linear micromorphic continuum: existence, uniqueness and continuous dependence in dynamics. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 20(10):1171–1197, 2014.
- [29] Paschalis Grammenoudis and Charalampos Tsakmakis. Micromorphic continuum Part I: Strain and stress tensors and their associated rates. *International Journal of Non-Linear Mechanics*, 44(9):943–956, 2009.
- [30] Elena F. Grekova and Gérard A. Maugin. Modelling of complex elastic crystals by means of multi-spin micromorphic media. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 43(5):494–519, 2005.
- [31] Claudia Britta Hirschberger, Ellen Kuhl, and Paul Steinmann. On deformational and configurational mechanics of micromorphic hyperelasticity—theory and computation. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 196(41):4027–4044, 2007.
- [32] Dorin Ieşan and Ludovico Nappa. Extremum principles and existence results in micromorphic elasticity. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 39(18):2051–2070, 2001.
- [33] Ralf Jänicke, Stefan Diebels, Hans-Georg Sehlhorst, and Alexander Düster. Two-scale modelling of micromorphic continua. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, 21(4):297–315, 2009.
- [34] Jena Jeong and Patrizio Neff. Existence, uniqueness and stability in linear Cosserat elasticity for weakest curvature conditions. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 15(1):78–95, 2008.
- [35] Jena Jeong, Hamidreza Ramézani, Ingo Münch, and Patrizio Neff. A numerical study for linear isotropic Cosserat elasticity with conformally invariant curvature. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 89(7):552–569, 2009.
- [36] Nina Kirchner and Paul Steinmann. A unifying treatise on variational principles for gradient and micromorphic continua. *Philosophical Magazine*, 85(33-35):3875–3895, 2005.
- [37] Severino L. Koh. A special theory of microelasticity. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 8(7):583–593, 1970.
- [38] Ekkehart Kröner. Der fundamentale Zusammenhang zwischen Versetzungsdichte und Spannungsfunktionen. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 142(4):463–475, 1955.
- [39] Isaak Abramovich Kunin. *Elastic Media with Microstructure II: Three-Dimensional Models*. Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [40] Johannes Lankeit, Patrizio Neff, and Frank Osterbrink. Integrability conditions between the first and second Cosserat deformation tensor in geometrically nonlinear micropolar models and existence of minimizers. *Preprint arXiv:1504.08003*, 2015.
- [41] Markus Lazar. On conservation and balance laws in micromorphic elastodynamics. *Journal of Elasticity*, 88(1):63–78, 2007.

- [42] David R. Lovett. Tensor properties of crystals. *From the 2nd edition 1999 CRC Press*, 1989.
- [43] Angela Madeo, Patrizio Neff, Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba, Luca Placidi, and Giuseppe Rosi. Band gaps in the relaxed linear micromorphic continuum. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 95(9):880–887, 2014.
- [44] Angela Madeo, Patrizio Neff, Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba, Luca Placidi, and Giuseppe Rosi. Wave propagation in relaxed micromorphic continua: modeling metamaterials with frequency band-gaps. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, 27(4):551–570, 2015.
- [45] Jean Mandel. Plastic waves in an infinite three dimensional medium. *Journal de Mécanique*, 1:3–30, 1962.
- [46] Paolo Maria Mariano and Giuseppe Modica. Ground states in complex bodies. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 15(02):377–402, 2009.
- [47] Paolo Maria Mariano and Furio Lorenzo Stazi. Computational aspects of the mechanics of complex materials. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, 12(4):391–478, 2005.
- [48] Johannes Meenen, Holm Altenbach, Victor Eremeyev, and Konstantin Naumenko. A variationally consistent derivation of microcontinuum theories. In *Shell-like Structures*, pages 571–584. Springer, 2011.
- [49] Raymond David Mindlin. Micro-structure in linear elasticity. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 16(1):51–78, 1964.
- [50] Anil Misra and Payam Poorsolhjouy. Granular micromechanics based micromorphic model predicts frequency band gaps. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, 28(1):1–20, 2015.
- [51] Maher Moakher and Andrew N. Norris. The closest elastic tensor of arbitrary symmetry to an elasticity tensor of lower symmetry. *Journal of Elasticity*, 85(3):215–263, 2006.
- [52] Vincent Monchiet and Guy Bonnet. On the inversion of non symmetric sixth-order isotropic tensors and conditions of positiveness of third-order tensor valued quadratic functions. *Mechanics Research Communications*, 38(4):326–329, 2011.
- [53] Ingo Münch and Patrizio Neff. Some remarks on rotational invariance conditions in linear elasticity, linear gradient elasticity and its connection to isotropy (in preparation). 2016.
- [54] Ingo Münch, Patrizio Neff, Angela Madeo, and Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba. The modified indeterminate couple stress model: Why Yang et al.’s arguments motivating a symmetric couple stress tensor contain a gap and why the couple stress tensor may be chosen symmetric nevertheless. *Preprint arXiv:1512.02053*, 2015.
- [55] Hiroyuki Nagahama and Roman Teisseyre. Micromorphic continuum and fractal fracturing in the lithosphere. In *Fractals and Dynamic Systems in Geoscience*, pages 559–574. Springer, 2000.
- [56] Patrizio Neff. On Korn’s first inequality with non-constant coefficients. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics*, 132(01):221–243, 2002.
- [57] Patrizio Neff. On material constants for micromorphic continua. In *Trends in Applications of Mathematics to Mechanics, STAMM Proceedings, Seeheim*, pages 337–348. Shaker-Verlag, 2004.
- [58] Patrizio Neff. The Cosserat couple modulus for continuous solids is zero viz the linearized Cauchy-stress tensor is symmetric. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 86(11):892–912, 2006.
- [59] Patrizio Neff. Existence of minimizers for a finite-strain micromorphic elastic solid. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics*, 136(05):997–1012, 2006.
- [60] Patrizio Neff. Existence of minimizers in nonlinear elastostatics of micromorphic solids. In *Encyclopedia of Thermal Stresses*, pages 1475–1485. Springer, 2014.
- [61] Patrizio Neff, Mircea Bîrsan, and Frank Osterbrink. Existence theorem for geometrically nonlinear Cosserat micropolar model under uniform convexity requirements. *Journal of Elasticity*, 121(1):1–23, 2015.
- [62] Patrizio Neff and Samuel Forest. A geometrically exact micromorphic model for elastic metallic foams accounting for affine microstructure. Modelling, existence of minimizers, identification of moduli and computational results. *Journal of Elasticity*, 87(2-3):239–276, 2007.
- [63] Patrizio Neff, Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba, Markus Lazar, and Angela Madeo. The relaxed linear micromorphic continuum: well-posedness of the static problem and relations to the gauge theory of dislocations. *The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics*, 68(1):53–84, 2015.
- [64] Patrizio Neff, Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba, Angela Madeo, Luca Placidi, and Giuseppe Rosi. A unifying perspective: the relaxed linear micromorphic continuum. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, 26(5):639–681, 2014.
- [65] Patrizio Neff and Jena Jeong. A new paradigm: the linear isotropic Cosserat model with conformally invariant curvature energy. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, 89(2):107–122, 2009.
- [66] Patrizio Neff, Jena Jeong, and Andreas Fischle. Stable identification of linear isotropic Cosserat parameters: bounded stiffness in bending and torsion implies conformal invariance of curvature. *Acta Mechanica*, 211(3-4):237–249, 2010.
- [67] Patrizio Neff and Ingo Münch. Curl bounds Grad on SO(3). *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 14(1):148–159, 2008.
- [68] Patrizio Neff, Dirk Pauly, and Karl-Josef Witsch. A canonical extension of Korn’s first inequality to H(Curl) motivated by gradient plasticity with plastic spin. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 349(23):1251–1254, 2011.
- [69] Patrizio Neff, Dirk Pauly, and Karl-Josef Witsch. Maxwell meets Korn: A new coercive inequality for tensor fields in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with square-integrable exterior derivative. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 35(1):65–71, 2012.

- [70] Patrizio Neff, Dirk Pauly, and Karl-Josef Witsch. Poincaré meets Korn via Maxwell: Extending Korn's first inequality to incompatible tensor fields. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 258(4):1267–1302, 2015.
- [71] S. Parameswaran and Severino L. Koh. Wave propagation in a micro-isotropic, micro-elastic solid. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 11(1):95–107, 1973.
- [72] Giovanni Romano and Raffaele Barretta. Micromorphic continua: non-redundant formulations. *to appear in Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, 2016.
- [73] Carlo Sansour. A unified concept of elastic-viscoplastic cosserat and micromorphic continua. *Le Journal de Physique IV*, 8(PR8):341–348, 1998.
- [74] Carlo Sansour, Sebastian Skatulla, and Hussein M. Zbib. A formulation for the micromorphic continuum at finite inelastic strains. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 47(11):1546–1554, 2010.
- [75] Masaru Shimbo. A geometrical formulation of asymmetric features in plasticity. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Engineering, Hokkaido University*, 77:155–159, 1975.
- [76] A. C. Smith. Inequalities between the constants of a linear micro-elastic solid. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 6(2):65–74, 1968.
- [77] Anthony James Merrill Spencer. Part III. Theory of invariants. *Continuum physics*, 1:239–353, 1971.
- [78] Roman Teisseyre. Earthquake processes in a micromorphic continuum. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 102(1):15–28, 1973.
- [79] Roman Teisseyre. Symmetric micromorphic continuum: wave propagation, point source solutions and some applications to earthquake processes. In *Continuum mechanics aspects of geodynamics and rock fracture mechanics*, pages 201–244. Springer, 1974.
- [80] Franck J. Vernerey, Wing Kam Liu, and Brian Moran. Multi-scale micromorphic theory for hierarchical materials. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 55(12):2603–2651, 2007.
- [81] Franck J. Vernerey, Wing Kam Liu, Brian Moran, and Gregory Olson. A micromorphic model for the multiple scale failure of heterogeneous materials. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 56(4):1320–1347, 2008.
- [82] Woldemar Voigt. Über die Beziehung zwischen den beiden Elasticitätsconstanten isotroper Körper. *Annalen der Physik*, 274(12):573–587, 1889.
- [83] Woldemar Voigt. *Lehrbuch der Kristallphysik*. 1908.

11 Appendix - One-dimensional standard Mindlin-Eringen model versus new relaxed micromorphic model

We let $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the displacement and $\hat{p} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the micro-distortion (we note that u corresponds to the first component of the displacement and $\hat{p}$ corresponds to P_{11}).

Considering a one-dimensional model we can reduce the energy of the Mindlin-Eringen model to:

$$\mu_e |u'(t) - \hat{p}(t)|^2 + \underbrace{\mu_c |\text{skew}(\cdot)|^2}_0 + \mu_{\text{micro}} |\hat{p}(t)|^2 + \frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} |\hat{p}'(t)|^2. \quad (193)$$

Therefore, in a pure one-dimensional setting, the μ_c -term does not appear. Furthermore, if $\mu_e \rightarrow \infty$ formally the energy reads:

$$\mu_{\text{micro}} |u'(t)|^2 + \frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} |u''(t)|^2, \quad (194)$$

which is a second gradient elastic energy. The equilibrium equations read:

$$2\mu_e (u'(t) - \hat{p}(t)) \delta u'(t) = 0, \quad \forall \delta u \in C_0^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}), \quad (195)$$

$$[-2\mu_e (u'(t) - \hat{p}(t)) + 2\mu_{\text{micro}} \hat{p}] \delta \hat{p}(t) + \mu L_c^2 \hat{p}' \delta \hat{p}' = 0. \quad \forall \delta \hat{p} \in C_0^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}),$$

from which we obtain:

$$\frac{d}{dx} [2\mu_e (u'(t) - \hat{p}(t))] = 0, \quad -2\mu_e (u'(t) - \hat{p}(t)) + 2\mu_{\text{micro}} \hat{p} + \mu L_c^2 \hat{p}'' = 0. \quad (196)$$

If we consider $L_c \rightarrow 0$ we obtain:

$$\frac{d}{dx} [2\mu_e (u'(t) - \hat{p}(t))] = 0, \quad -2\mu_e (u'(t) - \hat{p}(t)) + 2\mu_{\text{micro}} \hat{p} = 0. \quad (197)$$

This can be reduced to:

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left[2 \frac{\mu_e \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}} u'(t) \right] = 0, \quad \hat{p} = \frac{\mu_e}{\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}} u'(t). \quad (198)$$

Therefore, this is equivalent to a classical elasticity model with energy:

$$\mu_{\text{macro}} |u'(t)|^2, \quad \text{with } \mu_{\text{macro}} = \frac{\mu_e \mu_{\text{micro}}}{\mu_e + \mu_{\text{micro}}}. \quad (199)$$

Thus in the one-dimensional setting, also the Mindlin-Eringen format obeys our homogenization format.

Considering the relaxed micromorphic model we have instead:

$$\mu_e |u'(t) - \hat{p}(t)|^2 + \underbrace{\mu_e |\text{skew}(\cdot)|^2}_{=0} + \mu_{\text{micro}} |\hat{p}(t)|^2 + \underbrace{\frac{\mu L_c^2}{2} \|\text{Curl} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{p} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\|}_{=0}^2. \quad (200)$$

Therefore, there are automatically no terms with L_c and the equilibrium equations read:

$$\frac{d}{dx} [2\mu_e (u'(t) - \hat{p}(t))] = 0, \quad -2\mu_e (u'(t) - \hat{p}(t)) + 2\mu_{\text{micro}} \hat{p} = 0. \quad (201)$$

This is the same format of the Mindlin-Eringen model with $L_c \rightarrow 0$.

Here, it must be noted that in this case considering $\mu_e \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain formally a only first gradient elasticity model with energy:

$$\mu_{\text{micro}} |u'(t)|^2. \quad (202)$$

This is equivalent to a classical linear elasticity model with $\mu_{\text{macro}} = \mu_{\text{micro}}$, in contrast to (194).

Here, one of the differences of the standard Mindlin-Eringen format as compared to the new relaxed formulation clearly appears: the relaxed format does not reduce to a higher gradient elasticity model upon specifying certain parameters.

12 Appendix - Demonstration of equation (66)

By formula (65) we have:

$$(\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} = \underbrace{\mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\alpha\beta}}_{A_{\beta ij}} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta kl}. \quad (203)$$

On the other hand, it can be recognized that:

$$A_{\beta ij} = \underbrace{\mathfrak{M}_{ql\beta}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ql}}_{\tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\beta}} A_{\alpha ij} = \mathfrak{M}_{ql\beta}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijql}, \quad (204)$$

and moreover:

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\beta hk} = \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma hk} \underbrace{A_{\gamma mn} A_{mn\beta}^{-1}}_{\tilde{\delta}_{\beta\gamma}} = (\mathbb{C}_e)_{mnhk} A_{mn\beta}^{-1}. \quad (205)$$

Using (204) and (205) in (203) we get:

$$(\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijkl} = A_{\beta ij} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta hk} = \mathfrak{M}_{ql\beta}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijql} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{mnhk} A_{mn\beta}^{-1} = (\mathbb{C}_e)_{ijql} \underbrace{\mathfrak{M}_{ql\beta}^{-1} A_{mn\beta}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{mnhk}}_{\mathbb{1}_{qlhk}}. \quad (206)$$

From this last equality just comparing the first and the last equalities we deduce:

$$\mathfrak{M}_{ql\beta}^{-1} A_{mn\beta}^{-1} (\mathbb{C}_e)_{mnhk} = \mathbb{1}_{qlhk}. \quad (207)$$

Multiplying by $(\mathbb{C}_e^{-1})_{hkrs}$, we get:

$$\mathfrak{M}_{ql\beta}^{-1} A_{mn\beta}^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{mnrs} = (\mathbb{C}_e)_{qlrs}^{-1}. \quad (208)$$

In order to completely find the fourth order tensor $\mathbb{C}_e^{-1}$ in terms of the second order one we need to make explicit the form of A^{-1} . To this aim we recall that, by definition we set:

$$A_{\beta ij} = (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\alpha\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij}. \quad (209)$$

It can be checked that:

$$A_{ij\gamma}^{-1} = \mathfrak{M}_{ij\delta}^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\delta\gamma}^{-1}. \quad (210)$$

Indeed we compute:

$$A_{\beta ij} A_{ij\gamma}^{-1} = (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\alpha\beta} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha ij} \mathfrak{M}_{ij\delta}^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\delta\gamma}^{-1} = (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\delta} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\delta\gamma}^{-1} = (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\alpha\beta} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\delta\gamma}^{-1} = \tilde{\delta}_{\beta\gamma}, \quad (211)$$

where the symmetry of $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e$ was also been used. This last chain of equalities guarantees that (210) is actually the inverse of A . Then replacing (210) in (208) we get:

$$(\mathbb{C}_e)_{qlrs}^{-1} = \mathfrak{M}_{ql\beta}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{mn\delta}^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\delta\beta}^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{mnrs} = \mathfrak{M}_{ql\beta}^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_e)_{\delta\beta}^{-1} \mathfrak{M}_{rs\delta}^{-1}. \quad (212)$$